## Public Document Pack

## AGENDA FOR

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

Contact: Michael Cunliffe
Direct Line: 01612535399
E-mail: m.cunliffe@bury.gov.uk

Website:
www.bury.gov.uk

## To: All Members of Planning Control Committee

Councillors : G McGill (Chair), S Arif, C Boles, D Duncalfe, D Green, J Harris, M Hayes, D Quinn, S Thorpe, D Vernon and M Walsh

Dear Member/Colleague
Planning Control Committee
You are invited to attend a meeting of the Planning Control Committee which will be held as follows:-

| Date: | Tuesday, 25 April 2023 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Place: | Council Chamber, Bury Town Hall |
| Time: | 7.00 pm |
| Briefing <br> Facilities: | If Opposition Members and Co-opted Members require <br> briefing on any particular item on the Agenda, the <br> appropriate Director/Senior Officer originating the related <br> report should be contacted. |
| Notes: | https://councilstream.com/burycouncil/2175 |

## AGENDA

## 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
Members of the Planning Control Committee are asked to consider whether they have an interest in any of the matters on the Agenda and, if so, to formally declare that interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 21ST MARCH 2023 (Pages 3 4)

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday the 21st March 2023 are attached.
4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Pages 5-54)
Reports attached.
5 DELEGATED DECISIONS (Pages 55-68)
A report from the Head of Development Management on all delegated planning decisions since the last meeting of the planning control committee is attached.

6 PLANNING APPEALS (Pages 69-72)
A report from the Head of Development Management on all planning appeal decisions since the last meeting of the Planning Control Committee is attached.

## 7 URGENT BUSINESS

Any other business which by reason of special circumstances the Chair agrees may be considered as a matter of urgency.

## Minutes of: PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting: $\quad 21^{\text {st }}$ March 2023

| Present: | Councillor G McGill (in the Chair) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Councillors S Arif, D Berry, C Boles, D Duncalfe, D Green, |  |
| J Harris, M Hayes, D Quinn, S Thorpe and D Vernon |  |

Also in attendance: Councillor N Boroda
Public Attendance: No members of the public were present at the meeting.
Apologies for Absence: Councillor M Walsh

## PCC. 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillor M Walsh.
Councillor D Berry acted as a substitute representative for Councillor Walsh.

## PCC. 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

## PCC. 3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 21ST FEBRUARY 2023

## Delegated decision:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on the $21^{\text {st }}$ February 2023 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## PCC. 4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A report from the Head of Development Management was submitted in relation to applications for planning permission.

There was supplementary information to add in respect of application number 69115.
The Committee heard representations from a Ward Councillor in respect of application 69115. This was limited to three minutes for the speaker.

## Delegated decisions:

1. That the Committee Approve with Conditions the following application in accordance with the reasons put forward by the Development Manager in the report and subject to the conditions included:

## Mercedes-Benz of Whitefield, 845 Manchester Road, Bury

Variation of condition 16 (opening hours) of planning permission 58561: Amend from:The development hereby permitted shall not be open to customers or members of the public outside the following times: 08.00 to 18.30 Monday to Friday, 08.00 to 17.00 Saturdays and 11.00 to 17.00 Sundays

Amend to: The development hereby permitted shall not be open to customers or members of the public outside the following times: 06.00 to 22.00 Monday to Friday, 06.00 to 17.00 Saturdays and 11.00 to 17.00 Sundays

For the following item, the Planning Officer Mrs Leach left the meeting during discussions for the application due to a personal interest.
2. That the Committee Approve with Conditions the following application in accordance with the reasons put forward by the Development Manager in the report and subject to the conditions included:

## 10 Springside Road, Bury, BL9 5JE

Demolition of existing single storey side extension and garage; Erection of two/single storey extension to side and rear; Erection of single garage in rear garden; Alterations to driveway to create additional parking

## PCC. 5 DELEGATED DECISIONS

A report from the Head of Development Management was submitted listing all recent planning application decisions made by Officers using delegated powers since the last meeting of the Planning Control Committee.

## Delegated decision:

That the report and appendices be noted.

## PCC. $6 \quad$ PLANNING APPEALS

A report from the Head of Development Management was submitted listing all recent planning and enforcement appeal decisions since the last meeting of the Planning Control Committee.

## Delegated decision:

That the report and appendices be noted.

## PCC. 7 URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business was reported.

## COUNCILLOR G MCGILL

Chair
(Note: The meeting started at 7.00pm and ended at 7.34pm)

| Title | Planning Applications |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Planning Control Committee |
| On: | 25 April 2023 |
| By: | Development Manager |
| Status: | For Publication |

## Executive Summary

The attached reports present members with a description of various planning applications, the results of consultations, relevant policies, site history and issues involved.

My recommendations in each case are given in the attached reports.

## This report has the following implications

Township Forum/ Ward: Identified in each case.
Policy: Identified in each case.
Resources: Not generally applicable.
Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for: The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;
The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, I have concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based
upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town \& Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the Planning Control Committee shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions

## Development Manager

## Background Documents

1. The planning application forms and plans submitted therewith.
2. Certificates relating to the ownership.
3. Letters and Documents from objectors or other interested parties.
4. Responses from Consultees.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE CONTENTS OF EACH REPORT PLEASE CONTACT INDIVIDUAL CASE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED IN EACH CASE.
Township Forum - Ward: Bury West - Elton App No. 69298
Location: $\quad 1$ Rollesby Close, Bury, BL8 1EW
Proposal: First floor extension at side
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions Site Visit: N
Township Forum - Ward: Bury East - Moorside ..... App No. 68884Location: Land between 2 Ferngrove House, Rochdale Old Road \& Woodgate HillRoad, Bury, BL9 7LS
Proposal: Erection of 5 no. new dwellings
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions ..... Site Visit: N
Township Forum - Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Pilkington ..... App No. 69345
Park
Location: Whitefield Police Station, Bury New Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M458QNProposal: $\quad$ Siting of a single storey permanent Portakabin at rear to be used as aTactical Taser Training Room; 2 no. car wash screens at rear
Recommendation: Approve with ConditionsSite Visit: N

This page is intentionally left blank

Ward: Bury West - Elton
Applicant: Mr Tamoor Tariq
Location: 1 Rollesby Close, Bury, BL8 1EW
Proposal: First floor extension at side
Application Ref: 69298/Full Target Date: 28/03/2023
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
This application is to be considered by the Planning Control Committee due to the applicant being a Bury Councillor.

## Description

The application relates to a two storey brick built detached house located on a corner plot on an estate that consists of mainly detached houses of varying designs. There is a drive at the front with a conifer hedge and timber panelled fence at the side. The house is currently undergoing construction works following approval of planning permission for extensions and alterations in November 2021.

The immediate neighbour at No. 3 is the adjacent house set forward from the application house. There is a side path between the two properties and a 1.7 m high fence separates the rear gardens. The main rear elevation is set back 3.8 m from that of No. 1 and has a conservatory at the rear. Closest window to the boundary with No. 1 at ground floor is a dining room window. The property to the rear is set side on and separated by a footpath.

It is proposed to extend above the single storey element at the side of the house, adjacent to the shared side boundary with No. 3 Rollesby Close. It would run from the front elevation 9 m back, stopping approximately 2 m short of the rear elevation and have a pitched roof just below the main ridge. It would be finished in a render.

## Relevant Planning History

02612/E - Two storey front, single storey rear extension. - Enquiry completed 29/07/2021 50492 - Two storey extension at side. single storey extension at rear of garage. - Approved 10/10/2008
67461 - Two storey front extension; Single storey rear extension - Approved 10/11/2021

## Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 02/02/2023. Objection received from/on behalf of, the neighbour at No. 3 Rollesby Close.

- Concerned the foundations for the proposed 2nd story above the garage.
- Impact in terms of overshadowing and contravenes counsel planning guidelines document Adopted_SPD6_Jan_2020.pdf under the section of 45 degree rule section 5.2
- Remove light from the kitchen door and therefore removing light from another habitable room (kitchen) In addition to this it would remove the openness of the adjacent properties access to the rear of the property alley.
- The development as a whole is not in keeping with the street and properties across the road on Trimingham drive.
- It is also perplexing that a development for a senior member of the council is being handled by the same council. Surely there is a protocol so no internal pressure could be applied or alike for this to happen and categorically dispel any potential bias?
- The proposed structure does also not "design out crime" section 3.2 it only serves to create more light deprivation and in the winter months creates an enclosed feel leaving the elderly neighbour feeling vulnerable by creating a dark and hidden aspect. The
proposed structure will create a double story brick wall a mere 900 mm from the boundary. This must be classed as an overbearing structure so close to the perimeter.
- The adjacent landowner DOES NOT give consent for any scaffold or out riggers to cross her boundary in order to build this proposed party wall.

The objector has been informed of the Planning Control Committee.

## Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations <br> N/A

Pre-start Conditions - N/A

## Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations
SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations \& Extensions

## Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) together with other relevant material planning considerations. The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP Policy will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Visual amenity - In terms of design and appearance, the extension would be modest in scale and in keeping with the existing house. At the front, the immediate neighbour at No. 3 Rollesby is set forward to provide a degree of articulation along the frontage and, with the existing passageway retained to the side, avoid a terracing effect. As such the extension would not appear incongruous within the streetscape and would comply with UDP Policy $\mathrm{H} 2 / 3$ Extensions and Alterations and associated guidance in SPD6.

Residential amenity - Given the neighbour at No. 3 Rollesby Close is set forward, there is no significant impact at the front of the property. At the rear, the closest window at ground floor is a dining room window. The proposal as originally submitted was to extend back the length of the house to the rear elevation. Given the impact on the dining room window and adjacent patio area, this was not considered appropriate. Although the extension would be to the north west, it would appear as overdominant on the boundary and have a detrimental impact on residential amenity on occupier at No. 3 Rollesby Close. Amendments were therefore sought.

The plan was subsequently amended to set the extension back from the rear elevation, by just over 2 m . Although relatively minor, this alteration would help reduce the impact on the neighbour significantly, not necessarily with regard to light levels but rather visual dominance on the boundary. The revised plan also indicates a 45 degree line extending out from the dining room window at No. 3 Rollesby Close and that the extension would satisfy with this ' 45 degree rule'.

In terms of residential amenity, the proposal is on balance considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 Extensions and Alterations and associated guidance in SPD6.

Public representation - The objector's comments, where they relate to planning, have been addressed in the above report. The issue with regard to crime is not considered so relevant as, whilst it may appear more enclosed, the width of the pedestrian passageway between the houses would not be affected as the extension is at first floor.

The issue with regard to scaffolding is a private matter and not relevant to the planning application.

The consideration of applications made by Members and Officers is clearly set out within the constitution on how these should be determined. This scheme is duly presented to the Committee in line with the requirements of the adopted and published constitution.

## Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

## Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town \& Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings numbered RAD/2785/23/1RevA and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed.
3. The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall match those of the existing building.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

For further information on the application please contact Tom Beirne on 01612535361

## Viewpoints - Item 1
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PLANNI NG APPLICATION LOCATION PLAN APP. NO 69298
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ADDRESS: 1 Rollesby Close Bury


Planning, Environmental and Regulatory Services
(C) Crown Copyright and database right (2015). Ordnance Survey 100023063.
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Ward: Bury East - Moorside

## Applicant: LGC Properties Ltd

Location: Land between 2 Ferngrove House, Rochdale Old Road \& Woodgate Hill Road, Bury, BL9 7LS

Proposal: Erection of 5 no. new dwellings

## Application Ref: 68884/Full Target Date: 07/12/2022

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

## Description

The application relates to an area of land located on the junction of Rochdale Old Road and Woodgate Hill Road. The site is bounded by residential development to the west, east, north east and south with an area of green space to the north. The site is subject to a group TPO order.

Planning permission is sought for the construction of 5 dwelling houses. The proposal would comprise of 2 no. semi detached dwellings and 3 no. town houses. The site plans show parking to the front and side of the proposed semi-detached dwellings with gardens to the rear, and parking to the side and rear of the proposed town houses with gardens to the front and rear. The proposal seeks a new access from Woodgate Hill Road and would utilise an existing access from Ferngrove.

## Relevant Planning History

44153 - Outline Application - Residential Development - Erection of 3 storey block of 21 no. two bed apartments - Refused 02/08/2005

66285 - Erection of 5 no. dwellings - Refuse 15/09/2021
02412/E - Minor residential development scheme (6 no. proposed dwellings) with associated dedicated parking and improved highways accessibility - Enquiry completed 25/03/2020

LP/TPO/00240-T1 Sycamore- Fell (failed) T2 Sycamore- 20\% crown thin T4 SycamoreFell (failed) T5 Sycamore 20\% crown thin Group $13 x$ Sycamores- Fell (failed) T6 Sycamore 20\% crown thin Group 2 4x Sycamores- Fell (failed) - Consent refused 10/04/2017

LP/TPO-00461 - T25 Sycamore- Fell due to poor canopy form and to allow T28 to establish better. T26 Sycamore- Fell as there is a visible old decaying wound at the base with potential tree failure due to rot.T30,31,32 Sycamore- Fell all 3 trees due to damage trees showing major signs of decline. Consent approved 10/08/2017.

LP/TPO/00498 - T22, 28 \& 34 Sycamore- Fell due to tree pushing wall onto road and having an unbalanced canopy. T39 Sycamore- Fell due to large wound on centre stem. Consent granted 27/12/2017.

LP/TPO/00616 - T22 Sycamore- Fell and remove, T33 Sycamore- Fell and remove,T35 Sycamore- Fell and remove - Refused 26/07/2019

LP/TPO/00631-T1,2 \& 3 Sycamores- Fell - Split Decision.

## Publicity

8 objections received in relation to:

- The environment will change significantly.
- Loss of view
- Impact on house value
- Loss of privacy
- Drainage in the area is very poor. When it rains heavily water from the area drains onto the main road making it hazardous.
- The five properties on Woodgate Hill Road have been subject to serious flooding over recent years which has been caused due to the poor condition of the culvert which is situated in the grounds of this proposed development.
- The waterway that runs through the grounds not only collects run off water but is a crucial through-fare for the water running from the underground reservoir located at the top of woodgate hill road. It is not acceptable to build any properties without first addressing the culvert condition.
- Morris Homes (who own the land directly behind the five stated properties) have spent over $£ 30 \mathrm{k}$ attempting to re mediate the situation on their part, but this has proved unsuccessful and point to the fact that until the culvert condition is corrected within the grounds of 2 Ferngrove that floods will continue to affect our properties. Attempting to build structures in this area will add more risk to flooding both for ourselves and the potential purchasers.
- In her e-mail to United Utilities dated 07/01/21, Anna Mierzejewska (Environmental Scientist for LK Group) suggested that, in order for her to complete the SuDS strategy, she would require 'records of any historic flood events for the vicinity of the site'. Responding to Anna (email dated 15/01/21), United Utilities failed to provide any such information, stating that 'the Lead Local Flood Authority has responsibility for all surface water drainage concerns and their input to your proposal is critical. You should also consider whether it is necessary to discuss your proposal with the Environment Agency.' Are the residents of Woodgate Hill Road to assume therefore that the SuDS strategy was compiled WITHOUT knowledge of the numerous flooding incidences spanning the years 2015-2020? Have either Bury council (as LLFA) or Claire Nicholls (Environment Agency) communicated with LK Group at all about the proposals? If so, then surely, in the interests of transparency, any such communication ought to be shared with the residents of the lower cottages where flooding continues to impact homeowners' lives and properties.
- The applicant has displayed a very evident disregard for lawful procedure in removing several mature, protected trees from the proposed development site and in carrying out unauthorised works to the partially culverted watercourse. Indeed, the lack of a proper maintenance regime has seen the culvert fall into a poor state over the last few years, with blockages on-site contributing to the devastating flooding that has caused structural damage to all five properties at the lower end of Woodgate Hill Road.
- Bury council as LLFA are aware of these incidences with officers previously saying the address would be added to the LA's Flood Risk Management Strategy as a surface-water flood risk hot-spot. It is an absolute nonsense therefore that the postcode of the proposed site is deemed to be in an area at low-risk of surface-water flooding and, as such, I feel the application should be denied.
- No requirement to build 5 properties to improve housing shortage in the area.
- The proximity of the entrance to these properties will be very close to the junction of Fern grove and Rochdale old Rd which is already a busy enough junction. Add to this building works and vehicles this will make the junction a hazard. This junction being a hazard and extremely busy is also a major problem for the ambulances that use the road to get to Fairfield hospital.
- The parking and movement of the vehicle's / equipment need to construct these dwellings is also a concern on such a narrow road.
- Residents and shop customers park facing the intended access; this means that vehicles exiting the site would be on the wrong side of the road.
- Refuse collection vehicles have to reverse up Woodgate Hill Road and will create an impasse at the lower end where residents' vehicles are typically parked.
- Woodgate Hill Road is a variable width road and I am concerned about HGV traffic blocking residents' access during construction and using the mouth of the road (junction with B6222) to perform manoeuvres.
- Why is it that documents associated with the application contain different versions of the proposed development plan? One version shows a 5 -dwelling plan with 10 car park spaces (i.e. in the figures section of the PRA and in appendix A of the SuDs, both by LK Connect Group) but chapter 5 of the Transport Statement includes a version with 12 car park spaces and with the some dwellings facing in different directions to that shown on the Nov 2020 plan used by LK Connect. The planning statement compiled by Sedgewick Associates also alludes to a design with 12 car park spaces; which is it to be?
- Planning permission was requested around 10 years ago and refused for various reasons, one of these reasons was the protected trees within the property boundary. These trees over several years have slowly been unlawfully cut down by the land owners.
- The area up for development is covered in trees protected by TPO's and as such i am confused to how this application can go ahead.
- As mentioned in previous objection the trees that have been cut down by the landowners that were protected why has this never been investigated?
- Also 4 years ago trees under TPO were removed with permission of the planning department on the proviso that they were replaced ..... they have not.
- Images captured via Google street-view in June of 2012 clearly show the glory and splendour of the once beautiful plot. Indeed, with its dense plantation of trees, the garden offered the neighbourhood considerable amenity value, not least in its capacity to minimise the harmful effects of exhaust emissions and reduce noise pollution.
- It is my contention that the site has been purposely allowed to deteriorate; the collapsed stone wall just one indication of this. Outline plans suggest that pathways to two of the proposed dwellings are to be positioned, rather conveniently, at the point where the stone wall is at its most dilapidated. Several mature trees that used to line the same boundary wall have disappeared over the last 18 months. In fact, the arborist's report refers to just 11 trees and 2 groups whereas a total of 42 trees are named and tagged in Tree Preservation Order no. 204; a significant difference in number.


## Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Conditions requested in relation to the submission of full details of remedial works, the formation of the revised junction arrangements at Woodgate Hill Road/Rochdale Old Road and the formation of the widened footway crossing onto Ferngrove; submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan; and the implementation of visibility splays, vehicular/pedestrian access arrangements, turning and car parking facilities and bin storage.

Drainage Section - suggested SuDs condition, and an assessment of works undertaken to the watercourse without consent.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - A desk study and preliminary risk assessment has been provided which recommends that an intrusive investigation be carried out. Conditions requested that require the submission of a Contaminated Land Preliminary Risk Assessment, Site Investigation, Detailed Risk Assessment and Remediation Strategy.

Public Rights of Way Officer - No response
Waste Management - No response
United Utilities (Water and waste) - request SuDs condition and foul and surface water condition.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - The developer's ecological consultant identified no significant ecological issues. Issues relating to nesting birds, invasive species, proximity to a watercourse and biodiversity enhancement measures can be resolved via condition.

Highways England - Offer no objection
Pre-start Conditions - Conditions agreed by agent.
Unitary Development Plan and Policies
EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design
EN5 Flood Protection and Defence
EN5/1 New Development and Flood Risk
EN6 Conservation of the Natural Environment
EN6/3 Features of Ecological Value
EN7 Pollution Control
EN7/3 Water Pollution
EN7/5 Waste Water Management
EN8/2 Woodland and Tree Planting
H1/2 Further Housing Development
H2/1 The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development
HT2/1 The Strategic Route Network
HT2/4 Car Parking and New Development
HT6/2 Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations \& Extensions
SPD11 Parking Standards in Bury

## Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) together with other relevant material planning considerations. The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP Policy will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

## Principle (Residential)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be treated as a material planning consideration and it emphasises the need for local planning authorities to boost the supply of housing to meet local housing targets in both the short and long term. The Framework maintains the emphasis on identifying a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the five year supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed (e.g. some large sites could take up to ten years to be completed). As such, latest monitoring indicates that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land and this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential developments.

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test, which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against
the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than $75 \%$ ) of the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government show that Bury has a housing delivery test result of less than $75 \%$, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

Therefore, in relation to the proposed 5 dwellings, paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:
i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, taken as a whole.

Therefore, in this case the 'titled balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

Policy $\mathrm{H} 1 / 2$ states that the Council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses.

The site is located within the urban boundary, on a brownfield site and there are residential properties to all boundaries. The proposed development would not conflict with the surrounding land uses and would be located in a sustainable location with regard to public transport and services. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable in principle and would be in accordance with Policy H1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

## Design and Layout

Policy H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development requires all new residential development to make a positive contribution to the form and quality of the surrounding area. Policy $\mathrm{H} 2 / 2$ - The Layout of New Residential Development seeks to ensure that new residential development will be acceptable in terms of layout in order to provide a good quality residential environment. In addition to this, Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design seeks to ensure that any proposals would not have an adverse impact on the particular character and townscape of an area.

The immediate street scene is depicted by a mixture of terraced properties, with 2 semi-detached dwellings located to the west of the site. The proposed terrace would face towards Woodgate Hill, with a side elevation facing towards Rochdale Old Road.

The NPPF makes it clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental. This is further supported by the National Design Guide. The National Design Guide, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in 2019 states that well designed new development is influenced by" an appreciation and understanding of vernacular.....including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents."

A previous application for 5 no. dwellings at the site was refused as the proposed street scene did not extend far enough along Rochdale Old Road, and as such failed to show he relationship of the proposal on the dwellings along Rochdale Old Road or an active frontage along this street. The proposal was also refused on design terms as the previously proposed dwellings were top heavy, and failed to reflect the vertical emphasis of the neighbouring properties. The amended scheme has sought to address these previous reasons for refusal by means of an extended street scene, and amendments to the design of the proposed dwellings.

The proposed dwellings have been reduced in height and the extended street scene shows that they would be of a suitable scale and massing when reviewed in relation to the neighbouring properties. The layout of the plot facing towards Rochdale Old Road has been amended so that this property now presents an active frontage with a front door, and bay window adding elements of interest to this particular street scene. Additionally the dwellings that face towards Woodgate Hill Road also have active frontages and engage with the street scene.

The proposed dwellings utilise bay windows, and header and cill details that can be seen on the dwellings along Rochdale Old Road where as the quoin detailing is a nod towards the design elements of the dwellings along Woodgate Hill Road. The use of red brick and dark grey concrete tiles as facing materials are considered to be acceptable. The level of private amenity space for the proposed dwellings would be acceptable and there would be space within the side or rear garden for bin storage. The proposal seeks to retain the existing stone wall where possible along Rochdale Old Road, and Woodgate Hill Road however areas of this wall have had to be realigned or reduced in height to assist highway visibility. Concrete post and wooden fencing is proposed to mark the boundary of the gardens which is common within a residential context and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development has addressed the previous reasons for refusal and as such would be in accordance with Policies EN1/2, H2/1 and H2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

## Amenity

Neighbouring Amenity
UDP Policy H1/2 states that the council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses. There are no adopted aspect standards for new build residential properties however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case.

The side elevation of Plot 4 would face towards the rear elevations and amenity space of the nearest properties along Rochdale Old Road. A side ground floor WC window, and first floor landing window are proposed for this gable elevation. As these are not habitable room windows aspect standards have not been applied. The proposed gable would be located a minimum of 15.8 metres from the rear elevations of these properties exceeding the 13 metres required by SPD 6, and would be separated from these properties by a highway.

The side gable of Plot 5 would face towards the side elevation of 2 Ferngrove House which is included within the blue edge of the site. Again a side ground floor WC window, and first floor landing window are proposed for this gable elevation. As these are not habitable room windows aspect standards have not been applied. As the proposed side gable of these properties would face a side elevation, rather than a principal front or rear elevation the location of the proposed semi-detached properties is considered to be acceptable.

In relation to Plots 2 and 3 the habitable room windows for the ground floor, first floor and second floor are located on the front elevation, the elevation facing towards Woodgate Hill Road, and the rear elevation facing towards 2 Ferngrove House. Plot 1 has a double frontage with principal elevations facing towards Rochdale Old Road and Woodgate Hill Road. This elevation would also have habitable ground floor, first floor and second floor windows facing towards Rochdale Old Road.

The proposed front windows and the windows for Plot 1 would not have a direct relationship with the properties on Rochdale Old Road due to being set at an angle with this main road. The nearest windows would be separated from the front boundary of the dwellings on Rochdale Old Road by a minimum of approximately 18 metres exceeding the 7 metres required by SPD 6. These proposed windows would also be separated from these
properties by a main road. The proposed rear windows would be located approximately 16.8 metres from the facing boundary with No. 2 Ferngrove House, again exceeding the 7 metres required by SPD 6 .

The proposed front windows or Plots 2 and 3 would have an onward view of the junction of Rochdale Old road and Woodgate Hill, and an oblique view of the side elevation of No. 115-117 Rochdale Old Road. The proposed rear widows would be located approximately 19 metres from the facing boundary with No. 2 Ferngrove exceeding the 7 metres required by SPD 6 .

As such it is considered that the proposed town houses would comply with aspect standards.

## Occupant Amenity

The house types have been assessed to ensure that they would all comply with the minimum gross internal floor area requirements and associated minimum bedroom dimensions of the 'Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard'.

Three bed, 2 storey, 4 person dwellings should have internal floor spaces of 84 square metres. The submitted application does not provide full details of the internal floor space but the proposed floor plans have been measured. Each dwelling would therefore fall below the minimum internal floor space by approximately 4 square metres.

The loss in floor space, also equates to bedroom areas for the properties do not comply with national space standards. In this instance however, given that Bury do not currently have a local plan policy that requires applicant's to adhere to space standards a deficit of 4 square metres per property is not considered to be so significant that it would warrant refusal of the scheme.

## Highways and Parking

National Highways have confirmed that although close to an M66 overbridge, the development should not cause any structural problems to the motorway, nor will it have a significant traffic impact in relation to motorway use.

A previous scheme for $5 n$. dwellings at the site was refused for Highways reasons due to substandard and unsafe access, substandard visibility, intensification of access onto Ferngrove, no suitable accommodation for vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear and insufficient information in relation to surface water drainage, refuse collection arrangements, parking arrangements in accordance with SPD 11, relative levels between the site and the adjacent adopted highway. In addition, highways also highlighted that the previous application and submitted plans contained insufficient information to enable aspects in relation to drainage, refuse collection and relative levels to be adequately assessed.

The current application has been submitted with more detailed access and layout plans, as well as the submission of a Transport Statement that includes the provision of improvements at the junction of Rochdale Old Road and Woodgate Hill Road. These include new tactile crossing points, the introduction of a footpath along Woodgate Hill Road and vehicle tracking (including swept path of an HGV). The proposal also now shows visibility splays for the access onto Woodgate Hill Road, with no obstructions above 0.9 metres due to the height of the lowered wall.

Further details of the access from Ferngrove that include turning areas and a widening of the access to 4.8 metres have also been submitted. As with the Woodgate Hill access visibility sight lines and tracking for this access have also been shown.

The Council's Traffic Section have also been consulted as part of the application process. They have confirmed that the proposal could be supported subject to conditions that have been attached to this recommendation.

In relation to parking the proposal seeks to provide 12 off street parking spaces for the 5 no. dwellings. The site is located within a high access area and as such SPD 11 requires 2 spaces per 3 bed property. The proposal would provide 2 spaces per property for plots 2 5,3 spaces for plot 1 and 1 visitor parking space. The proposal would exceed the requirements for parking set out within SPD11 and as such the parking provision is considered to be acceptable.

## Ecology

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) have been consulted as part of the application process. The original report is now over two years old. It does however appear to have been reviewed in August 2022, though it is unclear whether or not this included a site visit as the only evidence of the review is the date against version 2 of the report. The GMEU ecologist is satisfied that it is very unlikely that there will have been any material changes to the ecological value of the site but do recommend that condition that requires a fully updated ecological appraisal prior to works starting on site.

## Protected Species

GMEU accept that all such species could be reasonably discounted based on the habitats available, scale of site and sites isolation from habitats where such species may be present. No further information or measures are required.

## Nesting Birds

The site was previously assessed as having very low potential for nesting birds with no scrub present and the mature trees open canopied and lacking rot holes. The trees are also retained. Since the ecological assessment scrub appears to have developed on the site a condition is proposed to limit works to trees and shrubs to the months outside of nesting season.

## Invasive Species

Monbretia was recorded on the site. The presence of the watercourse also makes the site high risk for species such as Himalayan balsam. Whilst not recorded by the ecologist, this species is an annual and would not have been visible in January. Streetview however indicates that this species is present.

Monbretia is not particularly invasive in this sort of location. The only risk of an offence would be if excavated material was transported off site. Retention or movement around the site would not be an offence. Himalayan balsam is however highly invasive. I therefore recommend a condition along the following lines is applied to any permission.

Prior to any earthworks a method statement detailing control and/or avoidance measures for Himalayan balsam and Monbretia should be supplied to and agreed in writing to the LPA. The agreed method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full.

## Proximity to a Watercourse

A minor watercourse passes through the site, presumably a tributary of the River Roch, though it appears to be culverted from this point to wherever it discharges, historic maps indicating it joined the Roch near the M66 roundabout. The Brook is being retained though one wooden footbridge appears to be proposed between parking and the houses. There are risks during and post construction of sediment and pollutants entering the watercourse and post development of additional discharge pressure on the culvert causing flooding downstream.

These risks however appear minor and can be dealt with through a construction and environmental management plan and drainage conditions.

## Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 174 of the NPPF 2021 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The main ecological features
on site are the retained trees, though streetview indicates more trees were present until relatively recently. The watercourse is also retained with a minor negative impact.

The ecological consultants also recommended enhancement measures along the Brook and bird boxes on retained trees. GMEU agree with these recommendations which do not appear to have been applied to the submitted landscaping plan.

GMEU also consider additional soft landscaping should be included including new native trees to replace those previously removed, planting along the Brook (introduction of suitable wetland trees and shrubs such as willows, alder, bird cherry, guelder rose and alder buckthorn, and riparian species such as branched bur-reed, and yellow flag-iris) and bird boxes for hole nesting birds on three of the retained trees. The details can be conditioned.

It has been noted that the proposed soft landscaping plan shows a significant number of new trees but these are not in line with GMEU recommendations in regards species choice. GMEU would prefer that the ornamental holly was replaced with the native holly and that some of the ornamental cherries are replaced with wild cherry or bird cherry. These details can be conditioned.

## Trees

The site is protected by a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO). UDP Policies EN8, EN8/1 and EN8/2 seek to support the retention of trees, woods, copses and hedgerows to encourage natural regeneration and new and replacement tree planting. Whilst the trees on site are protected it would appears that a number of trees have been lost from the site, and not adequately replaced.

Section 210(1) and section 202C(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provide that anyone who, in contravention of a Tree Preservation Order

- cuts down, uproots or willfully destroys a tree; or
- tops, lops or willfully damages a tree in a way that is likely to destroy it; or
- causes or permits such activities
is guilty of an offence. Anyone who contravenes an Order by damaging or carrying out work on a tree protected by an Order without getting permission from the local planning authority is guilty of an offence and may be fined. There is also a duty requiring landowners to replace a tree removed, uprooted or destroyed in contravention of an Order.

The applicant has been made aware prior to the application being submitted that the Council considers there to be a breach of the TPO legislation and that a number of trees have been removed either without consent or have failed to adhere to conditions attached to permissions by agreeing replacements prior to felling. The applicant has been notified that at least 10 trees appear to have been granted consent to be removed, with no replacements agreed shown on file.

In order to address this the applicant has provided a landscaping scheme to support the application that shows the provision of 19 no. of trees on site, in addition to the existing TPO trees. This would result in a nearly 2 for 1 replacement of every tree that has been previously removed without replacement.

The submitted Tree Protection Plan with Replanting Proposals (drawing 14) and updated Arboricultural shows the location of protection fencing for the existing trees. The parking for plots 1, 3 and 5 and the footpath links are also shown to be constructed with tree root friendly surfacing through the provision of cellular confinement systems as per Arboricultural Association Guidance Note 12. Subject to a condition to ensure that this plan is adhered to it is considered that the applicant has provided suitable replacements and suitable provision for protection of the existing trees on site.

Given the nature of the site, with a number of TPO trees that require protection it is also
proposed to remove permitted development rights from the dwelling in order to protect the vitality of the trees on site.

## Drainage

Tree clearance and culverting of the watercourse has already been undertaken, which was unauthorised and may have caused capacity issues downstream and contributed to flooding problems on Woodgate Hill Road. Further information is therefore required in relation to the drainage proposed at the site prior to development commencing that includes:

- details of surface water drainage based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the NPPF;
- Surface water discharge to be limited to the existing flow from site less a minimum $40 \%$ reduction in run-off to allow for climate change;
- An assessment of works undertaken to the watercourse without consent, including CCTV survey and assessment of the impacts on capacity of the watercourse and the consequent increased flood risk to properties on Woodgate Hill Road.
- Consideration of either increasing capacity or re-instating the original open watercourse.

These details would be required prior to any development taking place on site, however it is considered by the drainage engineer that these details could be dealt with via condition.

United Utilities have also been consulted as part of the application process and have requested conditions that require an investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options, a restricted rater of discharge of surface water, levels of the proposed drainage system including the proposed ground and finished levels in AOD, mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge and foul and surface water to drain on separate systems.

## Contaminated Land

Uses in the surrounding area include residential, retail premises, public open space and the M66 motorway. Previous uses at the site have included a greenhouse and gardens associated with Fern Grove House and three terraced properties. Previous uses in the surrounding area have included Fern Grove House, Fern Grove Woollen Mill (later a weaving mill and cotton mill) with associated reservoirs, three terraced properties immediately to the north and allotment gardens. The site is not situated within 250 m of any registered landfill sites. A stream runs through the site which is culverted to the north and south. The site is situated above the Lower Coal Measures Secondary A Aquifer which is overlain by Glacial Till.

A desk study and preliminary risk assessment has been provided which recommends that an intrusive investigation be carried out. It is therefore considered that appropriate to attach conditions requiring the relevant assessments to be undertaken prior to the commencement of development and the implementation of any necessary mitigation measures in the interests of health and safety. This complies with the NPPF and UDP Policy EN7 Pollution Control.

## Response to Objections

Material planning considerations in relation to trees, visual amenity, loss of privacy, highways and parking impacts and drainage have been dealt with within the main body of the report and the relevant consultations have been undertaken.

Loss of property value and view are non-material planning considerations not relevant to the decisions.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal
comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

## Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town \& Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings numbered Location Plan received 13th October 2022, 01 Existing Site Plan, 01 Rev C Proposed Site Plan, 03 Rev A, 04 Rev A, $05 \operatorname{Rev} A, 06 \operatorname{Rev} A, 07 \operatorname{Rev} A, 08 \operatorname{Rev} A, 11 \operatorname{Rev} A, 12 \operatorname{Rev} A, 13 \operatorname{Rev} A, 14-$ Tree Protection Plan with Replanting Proposals, 14 Rev A and J1349 access fig1 Rev A and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed.
3. Details/Samples of the (materials/bricks) to be used in the external elevations, together with details of their manufacturer, type/colour and size, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of above-ground construction. Only the approved materials/bricks shall be used for the construction of the development.
Reason. No material samples have been submitted and are required in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to UDP Policy EN1/1 Visual Amenity.
4. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the approved plans, no development shall commence unless and until full details of the following have been submitted on a topographical based survey of the site and adjacent adopted highways to the Local Planning Authority:

- Dilapidation survey of the footways and carriageways leading to and abutting the site in the event that subsequent remedial works are required following construction of and statutory undertakes connections to the proposed development.
- Formation of the revised junction arrangements at Woodgate Hill Road/Rochdale Old Road to a specification to be agreed, incorporating a swept path analysis of the junction by all large vehicles that utilise the route, the provision of a tactile paved pedestrian crossing point in a position to be agreed at the junction, provision of a 2.0 m wide footway and extended limits of adopted highway between Rochdale Old Road and the pedestrian access point to Plots $4 \& 5$, revised footway/new 0.9 m (maximum) height wall alignment/position at the interface with Rochdale Old Road and in the vicinity of Plots $3 \& 4$, demarcation of the new limits of the adopted highway, measures to prevent the discharge of water from the proposed private shared access onto the adopted highway and all associated alterations to road markings and highway/highway drainage remedial works.
- Formation of the widened footway crossing onto Ferngrove to a specification and limits to be agreed, incorporating all associated boundary treatment alterations, measures to prevent the discharge of water from the proposed private shared access onto the adopted highway and highway remedial works.

The details subsequently approved shall be implemented to an agreed programme.
Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site in terms of highway safety, ensure good highway design and maintain the integrity of the adopted highway, all in the interests of highway safety Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, HT2/1 - The Strategic Route Network, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and HT6/2Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
5. No development shall commence unless and until a 'Construction Traffic Management Plan' (CTMP), has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority for each phase of the development and shall confirm/provide the following:

- Access route for construction traffic from the highway network;
- Hours of operation and number of vehicle movements;
- Access point(s) for construction traffic and all temporary works required to facilitate access for ground works/construction vehicles,
- If proposed, details of site hoarding/gate positions clear of required visibility splays onto the adopted highway;
- The provision, where necessary, of temporary pedestrian facilities/protection measures on the highway;
- A scheme of appropriate warning/construction traffic warning signage in the vicinity of the site and its access(es) onto the adopted highway;
- Confirmation of hours of operation and number of vehicle movements;
- Arrangements for the turning and manoeuvring of vehicles within the curtilage of the site and/or measures to control/manage delivery vehicle manoeuvres;
- Parking on site or on land within the applicant's control of operatives' and construction vehicles, together with storage on site of construction materials;
- Measures to ensure that all mud and other loose materials are not spread onto the adjacent adopted highways as a result of the groundworks operations or carried on the wheels and chassis of any vehicles leaving the site and measures to minimise dust nuisance caused by the operations.

The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and the measures shall be retained and facilities used for the intended purpose for the duration of the construction period. The areas identified shall not be used for any other purposes other than the turning/parking of vehicles and storage of construction materials.

Reason. Information not submitted at application stage. To mitigate the impact of the construction traffic generated by the proposed development on the adjacent residential streets, and ensure adequate off street car parking provision and materials storage arrangements for the duration of the construction period and that the adopted highways are kept free of deposited material from the ground works operations, in the interests of highway safety pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and HT6/2 Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
6. The visibility splays indicated on the approved plans shall be implemented before the development is first occupied/accesses brought into use and subsequently maintained free of obstruction above the height of 0.9 m .
Reason. To ensure the intervisibility of the users of the site and the adjacent highways in the interests of road safety pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
7. The vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements within the curtilage of the site indicated on the approved plans shall be implemented before the development is
brought into use.
Reason. To ensure good highway design in the interests of road and pedestrian safety pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and Built Design and HT6/2 Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
8. The turning facilities within the curtilage of the site indicated on the approved plans shall be provided before the development is brought into use and the areas used for the manoeuvring of vehicles shall subsequently be maintained free of obstruction at all times.
Reason. To minimise the standing and turning movements of vehicles on the highway in the interests of road safety pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
9. The car parking indicated on the approved plans shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to the dwellings to they relate hereby approved being occupied and thereafter maintained at all times.
Reason. To ensure adequate off street car parking provision in the interests of road safety pursuant to policies HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development and H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.
10. Bin storage arrangements shall be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling in accordance with Waste Management's 'Guide to Refuse Collection Requirements \& Storage Methods for New Developments' prior to first occupation and shall thereafter be maintained.
Reason. To ensure adequate provision for the storage and disposal of refuse within the curtilage of the site, clear of the adopted highway Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development.
11. No development shall commence unless and until:-

- A contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment report to assess the actual/potential contamination and/or ground gas/landfill gas risks at the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority;
- Where actual/potential contamination and/or ground gas/landfill gas risks have been identified, detailed site investigation and suitable risk assessment shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- Where remediation/protection measures is/are required, a detailed Remediation Strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.
Reason. The scheme does not provide full details of the actual contamination and subsequent remediation, which is required to secure the satisfactory development of the site in terms of human health, controlled waters, ground gas and the wider environment and pursuant to National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

12. Following the provisions of Condition 11 of this planning permission, where remediation is required, the approved Remediation Strategy must be carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within agreed timescales; and A Site Verification Report detailing the actions taken and conclusions at each stage of the remediation works, including substantiating evidence, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being brought into use.
Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site in terms of human health, controlled waters and the wider environment and pursuant to National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
13. No development shall commence unless and until details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:
(i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water in accordance with BRE365. Details of proposed maintenance arrangements should also be provided;
(ii) Surface water discharge to be limited to existing flow from site less a minimum $40 \%$ reduction in run-off to allow for climate change to prevent surcharge of public sewerage system downstream of the proposed development;
(iii) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
(iv) An assessment of the works undertaken to the watercourse without consent shall be undertaken including cctv survey and assessment of the impacts on capacity of the watercourse and consequent increased flood risk to properties on Woodgate Hill Rd. Consideration should be given to either increasing capacity or re-instating the original open watercourse
(v) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable; and
(vi) Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems

Reason. To promote sustainable development. The current application contains insufficient information regarding the proposed drainage scheme to fully assess the impact pursuant to Unitary Development Plan Policies EN5/1- New Development and Flood Risk, EN7/3 - Water Pollution and EN7/5 - Waste Water Management and chapter 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change of the NPPF.
14. Prior to any earthworks or vegetation clearance:

- A fully updated ecological appraisal will be provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and
- Any new recommendations of the report implemented in full prior to occupation.
Reason. In order to ensure that no harm is caused to a Protected Species pursuant to policies EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment and EN6/3Features of Ecological Value of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

15. No works to trees or shrubs shall occur between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason. In order to ensure that no harm is caused to a Protected Species pursuant to policies EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment and EN6/3Features of Ecological Value of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
16. Prior to any earthworks a method statement detailing control and/or avoidance measures for Himalayan Balsam and Monbretia should be supplied to and agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The agreed method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full.
Reason. The scheme does not provide full details of the actual extent of Monbretia and Himalayan Balsam in the interest of UDP Policy EN9 - Landscape and pursuant to National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 - Conserving and
enhancing the natural environment.
17. Notwithstanding the submitted landscaping scheme shown on plan numbers 13 Rev A, 14 -Tree Protection Plan with Replanting Proposals, and 14 Rev A, an amended landscaping scheme shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The contents of the plan shall include 19no. native trees, suitable planting along the Brook, and the provision of bird boxes. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented not later than 12 months from the date the buildings are first occupied or within the first available tree planting season; in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment received 27th March 2023; and any trees or shrubs removed, dying or becoming severely damaged or becoming severely diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size or species to those originally required to be planted.
Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site and in the interests of visual amenity pursuant to Policies H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and EN8/2 - Woodland and Tree Planting of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment of the NPPF.
18. No development shall commence unless and until a construction and environmental management plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include the steps to be taken to prevent the discharge of silt run-off, materials or dust or any accidental spillages entering the minor watercourse that runs through the site. The approved plan only shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any works and maintained for the duration of the build out of the development.
Reason. Information not submitted at application stage. To ensure a safe and satisfactory development of the site in relation to the protection of the minor watercourse that runs through the site from any pollutants and construction disturbance which may cause risk, pursuant to chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment of the NPPF.
19. All trees to be retained on site shall be protected in accordance with BS 5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction" and the submitted Tree Protection Plan with Replanting Proposals (drawing 14) and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (received 27th March 2023). The development shall not commence unless and until the measures required by the British Standard and the submitted documentation are implemented and all measures required shall remain in situ until the development has been completed.
Reason. To avoid the loss of trees which are of amenity value to the area pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and EN8/2 - Woodland and Tree Planting of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.
20. Notwithstanding the terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as subsequently amended, no development shall be carried out within the terms of Classes A to G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order and Classes A to F of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order, without the submission and approval of a relevant planning application.
Reason. To avoid the loss of trees which are of amenity value to the area pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and EN8/2 - Woodland and Tree Planting of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

For further information on the application please contact Helen Pressley on 01612535277
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Applicant: Greater Manchester Police
Location: Whitefield Police Station, Bury New Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 8QN
Proposal: Siting of a single storey permanent Portakabin at rear to be used as a Tactical Taser Training Room; 2 no. car wash screens at rear

## Application Ref: 69345/Full <br> Target Date: 18/04/2023

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

## Description

The proposal relates to the rear service area at Whitefield Police Station, Bury New Road which is located outside of and immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the All Saints Conservation Area, Whitefield. Access is gained off Salisbury Street which leads into a car park at the front, or into the barrier-controlled car park for employees only at the rear. The site is bounded by residential properties to the north and west on Bury New Road, to the south on Morley Street and to the east on Nuttall Avenue, where the roof of these houses are just visible over the wall which forms the boundary car park.

The proposal is for a portable building (Portakabin) within the rear service yard area (not upon a designated parking space). It would measure 10 m long $\times 4.186 \mathrm{~m}$ wide $\times 2.96 \mathrm{~m}$ high above ground level. It would be positioned close to the rear of the building around 11 m from the rear boundary to neighbouring rear gardens to the east. It would be used in association with Tactical Taser Training that presently takes place at the site, to be used as a meeting room to assess and observe taser training that takes place within the existing rear wing of the building.

The proposal also includes the installation of two 6 m long $\times 2.1 \mathrm{~m}$ high car wash screens adjacent to the final bay of the rear wing, with the area to be enclosed to be used for washing vehicles.

The supporting statement confirms that Greater Manchester Police has been operating taser training at the site for approximately 5 years, largely taking place within the main building. However, some scenario or role play based activity training takes place in a garage area in the rear wing of the building. Training takes place from around 08:00 to 16:00 Monday to Friday.

There is a requirement for the taser trainers to relocate from an office in the main building into the proposed portable building, which would be used between 06:30 and 16:00 Monday to Friday. Taser training would not be conducted within the portable building, but would continue to takes place from the present locations.

As the Roads Policing Unit is to be relocated to the site, there is a requirement to re-start operational vehicle washing at the site. The current vehicle wash has become obsolete and a new jet wash facility would be introduced with protective car wash screens adjacent to the perimeter walls to protect neighbouring properties from spray. The jet wash would not be used between 00:00 and 06:30.

## Relevant Planning History

47152: Provision \& siting of temporary portable buildings - Approve with Conditions 19/12/2006

51867: Retention of temporary portable buildings for a period of 3 years - Withdrawn by Applicant 05/01/2010

52157: Single storey portable building (to replace 2 storey building) for a temporary period of 3 years - Approve with Conditions 05/03/2010

## Publicity

Advertised by direct neighbour notification on 23/02/2023. Five representations have been received objecting to the proposal in relation to the following:

- Concerned about the noise impacts from activity in the proposed building. There are already noise issues with existing taser training that takes place at the site. The proposed building should be appropriately sound proofed.
- The use of the portable building should be limited to between 07:30 to 16:30 Monday to Friday and car washing during the day.
- Taser training should take place at alternative GM Police sites that do not have such a close relationship with adjacent sensitive uses.
- The application is also very vague (e.g. in relation to the glass screens) and more information is needed.
- The submission states the wrong address for the site and doesn't acknowledge that the site is adjacent to Stand Conservation Area and opposite Uplands, which is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset.
- Request that neighbours are informed via weekly emails of taser training dates and times.
- Concerned about the increased number of Roads Policing Unit vehicles (22) and shift handover times, which would create increased noise levels.


## Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section: No objection.
Environmental Health - Pollution Control: No comments to make.
Conservation Officer: No objection.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant
Unitary Development Plan and Policies
EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2 Conservation Area Control
EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design
EN7/2 Noise Pollution

## Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) together with other relevant material planning considerations. The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP Policy will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

## ASSESSMENT

The proposal relates to an existing police station. Whilst representations from neighbours raise concerns about the impact of taser training and car washing on amenity, these activities already take place at the site and are necessarily and reasonably related to the lawful use of the site as a police station and do not specifically require planning permission. Therefore, the principle of the development of a portable building and car wash screens is acceptable.

## Visual Amenity and impact on All Saints Conservation Area

UDP Policy EN1/2, seeks to ensure that any proposals would not have an adverse impact on the particular character and townscape of an area. Policy EN2/2 requires development within a Conservation Area to preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the area.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The development would be sited within the existing police compound, behind the two storey police station building relative to the principal public vantage of Bury New Road. The rear wing of the police station and the high boundary wall would obscure the building and screens from dwellings to the east of the site, which are set at a lower level.

The Council's Conservation Officer does not object to the proposal. Whilst the site is immediately adjacent to Whitefield All Saints Conservation Area, due to the factors noted above, the development would not be visible from within it or within the context of the Conservation Area.

The proposal would not therefore have any unacceptable impacts on visual amenity or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would therefore be compliant with UDP Policy EN1/2 and EN2/2.

## Residential Amenity

UDP Policy EN1/2 requires consideration of various factors relating to built design, including the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding area and impact on residential amenity. UDP Policy EN7/2 states that the Council will not permit development which could lead to an unacceptable noise nuisance to nearby occupiers.

As noted above, none of the proposed development would be visible from outside of the immediate confines of the site and so would not have any unacceptable overbearing impacts to neighbouring properties.

Objections refer to the impact of noise from taser training on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and the potential impacts of vehicle movements associated with the future partial occupation of the site by the Roads Policing Unit

The proposal relates to an existing police station which has no planning restrictions on activities at the site. Taser training presently takes place at the site and is clearly a cause of some nuisance to neighbouring occupier's amenity. It appears that Greater Manchester Police have taken steps to consult and provide some reassurance to neighbours. However, the local planning authority cannot exercise control over the activities that the neighbours have raised concerns in relation to, as they are reasonably associated with the lawful occupation of the site as a police station i.e. taser training, washing of police vehicles, shift patterns of the Roads Policing Unit.

The proposed portable building would be for office use only and would not be for the facilitation of taser training. Therefore, the proposed development would not be a source of noise nuisance to neighbouring dwellings. It would not therefore be necessary to limit the hours of use of the portable building and no controls can be had over car washing as it does not require planning permission.

## Other matters

The proposed development would not result in the obstruction of existing vehicle parking provision at the site.

## Response to representations

The application is also very vague (e.g. in relation to the glass screens) and more information is needed.
A further statement was submitted, which gave a fuller account of the proposal.
The submission states the wrong address for the site and doesn't acknowledge that the site is adjacent to Stand Conservation Area and opposite Uplands, which is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset.
The proposal has been assessed in relation impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Request that neighbours are informed via weekly emails of taser training dates and times. This is a matter that would have to be taken up directly with Greater Manchester Police.

Concerned about the increased number of Roads Policing Unit vehicles (22) and shift handover times, which would create increased noise levels.
The Planning Authority has no remit or control over vehicle movements at the site.

## CONCLUSION

Whilst there are objections to the proposal, the development has been assessed as not having any unacceptable impacts upon the amenity neighbouring occupiers, visual amenity and the character and appearance of the All Saints Conservation Area.

Given the above, the proposal would be compliant with the above stated UDP policies and the NPPF. Therefore, in accordance with the Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the proposal merits approval.

## Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively and positively to issue the decision without delay. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

## Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town \& Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings and supporting information

Existing Location \& Block Plan (Dwg No. TM GMPM45 EXIST)
Proposed Location and Block Plan (Dwg No. TM GMPM45 PROP)
Plan \& Elevations Drawing (Dwg No. TTM TN104PED)
Portakabin Screen Specification
and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of
design pursuant to the policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed.
For further information on the application please contact Dean Clapworthy on 0161253 5317




## Portakabin

## PLANNING PERMISSION APPLICATION

## Greater Manchester Police - Whitefield - Car Washing Screens Specification:

2no 6000mm x 2100mm aluminium glazed car washing screens:

- 6 no $100 \mathrm{~mm} \times 100 \mathrm{~mm}$ box steel posts, with $300 \mathrm{~mm} \times 300 \mathrm{~mm}$ base plates (black powder coated).
- $\quad 4 n o$ Aluminium screen frames (black powder coated).
- 8 no $1500 \mathrm{~mm} \times 1818 \mathrm{~mm}$ laminated safety glass panels.

All installed as per the location annotated on the Proposed Location and Block Plan - TM GMPM45 PROP A1
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| Chief Executive/ <br> Strategic Leadership <br> Team | Executive <br> Member/Chair | Ward Members | Partners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Scrutiny Committee | Committee | Council |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

This is a monthly report to the Planning Control Committee of the delegated planning decisions made by the officers of the Council.

### 2.0 CONCLUSION

That the item be noted.

## List of Background Papers:-None

## Contact Details:-

David Marno, Head of Development Management Planning Services, Department for Resources and Regulation 3 Knowsley Place
Bury BL9 0EJ
Tel: 01612535291
Email: d.marno@bury.gov.uk

## Planning applications decided using Delegated Powers

Between 13/03/2023 and 16/04/2023

## Ward: Bury East

| Application No.: $\quad 69020 \quad$ App. Type: FUL | 22/03/2023 | Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: $\quad 27$ Walnut Avenue, Bury, BL9 7LZ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Single storey rear extension |  |  |
| Application No.: $\quad 69045 \quad$ App. Type: FUL | 30/03/2023 | Approve with Conditions |  |
| Location: | RRG, 1 Bolton Street, Bury, BL9 0EY |  |  |
| Proposal: | Single storey extension to existing workshop |  |  |

Application No.: 69237 App. Type: LBC 17/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: The Fusilier Museum, Moss Street, Bury, BL9 0DF

Proposal: Listed building consent for repair and adaptation of roofs and gutters to address water ingress issues

Application No.: 69265 App. Type: FUL 13/04/2023 Approve with Conditions

Proposal: First floor side extension.
Application No.: $69267 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 04/04/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location:
2A \& 2B Wash Lane, Bury, BL9 6AS
Proposal:

| Application No.: $69286 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 15/03/2023 Approve with Conditions |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 75 Hurst Street, Bury, BL9 7ES |  |  |
| Proposal: | Single storey rear extension |  |  |


| Application No.: $69293 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 27/03/2023 Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 30 The Rock, Bury, BL9 ONT |

Application No.: 69327 App. Type: LDCP 05/04/2023 Lawful Development
Location: 173 Rochdale Road, Pimhole, Bury, BL9 7BB
Proposal: Lawful development certificate for proposed change of use from bakery to meat shop

Application No.: 69342 App. Type: FUL 27/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location:
Proposal: Single storey side/rear extension and Roof over rear bay window

## Ward: Bury East - Redvales



| Application No.: $69212 \quad$ App. Type: GPDE 13/03/2023 | Prior Approval Required \& Granted - Ext |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 5 Grundy Lane, Bury, BL9 9BZ |  |
| Proposal: | Prior approval for proposed single storey extension |  |

Application No.: $69218 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 30/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 27 Parkhills Close, Bury, BL9 9HB
Proposal: $\quad$ Two storey side extension; Single/two storey rear extension
Application No.: 69230 App. Type: LDCP 15/03/2023 Lawful Development
Location: 16 Whelan Close, Bury, BL9 9QH

Proposal: Lawful development certificate for proposed single storey side and rear extensions to an existing terraced house to create enlarged kitchen/dining area.

## Ward: Bury West - Elton

| Application No.: $68416 \quad$ App. Type: LDCP 22/03/2023 Lawful Development |
| :--- |
| Location: 14 Skegness Close, Bury, BL8 1EQ |
| Proposal:Lawful develpment certificate for proposed single storey pitched roof extension to rear and <br> garage conversion |

Application No.: 69177 App. Type: FUL 05/04/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 71 Hunstanton Drive, Bury, BL8 1XH
Proposal: Single storey rear extension and porch at front

## Ward: Bury West - West

| Application No.: $69132 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 15/03/2023 Refused |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: 104 Ainsworth Road, Bury, BL8 2RS |  |
| Proposal: | Change of use from existing 6 no. bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO - Class C4) to 7 <br> no. bedroom ( 7 person) house in multiple occupation (HMO - Sui Generis) |

Application No.: 69223 App. Type: FUL 27/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 165 Bolton Road, Bury, BL8 2NW
Proposal: Alterations to shop front/installation of roller shutters and subdivision of 1 no. shop into 2 no. retail units; Two/single storey extension at rear and alterations to form 2 no. ground floor flats and 1 no. additional first floor flat; New wall for bin storage


## Ward: North Manor


Application No.: 69252 App. Type: FUL 13/04/2023 Refused

## Location: 120 Railway Street, Summerseat, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL9 5QD

Proposal: Build up walls of existing single storey rear extension with replacement flat roof with glass lantern; Alterations to windows/doors and new window opening to side elevation and Dormer and new rooflight at rear

| Application No.: $69262 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 27/03/2023 Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 21 Greenmount Drive, Tottington, Bury, BL8 4HA |
| Proposal: | Two storey rear extension with glazed balcony; Two storey side extension with front \& rear <br> dormers; Two storey front extension; Single storey rear extension |


Application No.: $69340 \quad$ App. Type: LDCP 06/04/2023 Lawful Development
Location: 9 St Margarets Close, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 2LY

Proposal: $\quad$| Lawful development certificate for proposed demolition of conservatory, Single storey side and |
| :--- |
| rear extension and Porch to front |



| Application No.: $69294 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 15/03/2023 | Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: $\quad 2$ Norwood, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9WA |  |  |
| Proposal: |  |  |


| Application No.: $69331 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 24/03/2023 Approve with Conditions |
| :--- |
| Location: 17 Castle Hill Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 OFR |
| Proposal: |
|  |
|  |
| Variation of condition no. 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 68332 for single storey <br> extensions at side and rear: Increase the width of single storey rear extension |

Application No.: $69341 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 30/03/2023 Refused
Location: 6 Mowbray Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 OLP
Proposal:

| Raising of roof ridge height with hip to gable roof extension, Loft conversion and Dormers at |
| :--- |
| front and rear |

Application No.: $69346 \quad$ App. Type: FUL $14 / 04 / 2023$ | Location: | $17 \& 19$ Wilton Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 OHD |
| :--- | :--- |

Application No.: 69348 App. Type: FUL 04/04/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 56 Windsor Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 ODE
Proposal:

Application No.: 69382 App. Type: GPDE 04/04/2023 Prior Approval Not Required - Extension Location: 45 Windsor Crescent, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 ODD

Proposal: Prior approval for proposed single storey rear extension

## Ward: Prestwich - St Mary's



Ward: Radcliffe - East

| Application No.: $68873 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 15/03/2023 Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Former Ashworth, Miller Street, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 4AF |

Application No.: $69127 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 22/03/2023
Location: 42 Gorse Hill Cottages, Starling Road, Bury, BL8 2HE
Proposal: Dropped kerb and a new vehicular access with Conditions
Application No.: $69145 \quad$ App. Type: FUL $\quad$ 15/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 54 Starling Road, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 4LN
Proposal: $\quad$ Single storey extension at side / rear
Application No.: 69200 App. Type: PIAPA 30/03/2023 Prior Approval Required and Granted
Location: 17 Deansgate, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 2SH

Proposal: Prior approval for change of use of upper floor and part lower floor of existing use (Class E) to 1 no. flat (Class C3) and commercial space (Class E)

| Application No.: $69280 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 24/03/2023 Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 16 Bury And Bolton Road, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 4LD |
| Proposal: | Two storey rear \& side extension; Single storey front extension; Single storey rear extension; <br> Raised decking at rear |


| Application No.: $69336 \quad$ App. Type: TEL $15 / 03 / 2023$ | Prior Approval Required and Refused |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Pavement outside Radcliffe Hall C of E Methodist Primary School, Bury Street, Radcliffe, M26 |
| 2GB |  |
| Proposal: | Prior approval for proposed 5 G telecoms installation: H3G 15 m street pole and additional <br> equipment cabinets |

## Ward: Radcliffe - North and Ainsworth

| Application No.: $69254 \quad$ App. Type: OUT15/03/2023 Approve with Conditions <br> Land adjacent to 100 Bury New Road, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 6QB |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposal: $\quad$Outline application for erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with details of access, layout and <br> scale (appearance and landscaping matters reserved) |

Application No.: 69268 App. Type: FUL 15/03/2023 Approve with Conditions

## Location:

17 Strangford Street, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 3TN
Proposal: Dormer extensions at front and rear and Front porch

## Ward: Radcliffe - West

Application No.: $69285 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 30/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 11 Charter Avenue, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1LU
Proposal:
Single storey front extension; Single storey rear extension.
Application No.: $69338 \quad$ App. Type: PIAPA 30/03/2023 $\quad$ Prior Approval Required and Granted
Location: $3 / 5$ Grosvenor Street, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 4BP
Proposal:

Prior approval for proposed change of use from commercial/retail (Class E) to 2 no. dwellings
(Class C3) to part ground floor/first floor (shop at front to be retained)

## Ward: Ramsbottom + Tottington - Tottington

Application No.: $68433 \quad$| App. Type: FUL |
| :--- |
| Burnt House Farm, Turton Road, Tottington, Bury, BL8 3QF | Approve with Conditions

Location:
Proposal:
Erection of 1 no.detached dwelling to replace existing

| Application No.: $69187 \quad$ App. Type: P3JPA 30/03/2023 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Bank House, 16-18 Bank Street, Walshaw, Tottington, Bury, BL8 3AZ |
| Proposal: | Prior approval for proposed change of use of ground floor from shop (Class E) to 2 no. flats <br> (Class C3) |

Application No.: 69363 App. Type: FUL 12/04/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 319A Turton Road, Tottington, Bury, BL8 3QF

Proposal: Single/Two Storey Side Extension With Balcony

## Ward: Ramsbottom and Tottington - Ramsbottom

Application No.: $69052 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 29/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 11 Bridge Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, BLO 9AB
Proposal:

| Change of use of vacant betting shop (Sui Generis) into restaurant (Class E) including |
| :--- |
| installation of extraction flue to rear; additional ground floor side window, replacement |
| windows to the front ground floor windows with timber sliding sash windows and repair and |
| paint all other existing windows |

Application No.: 69053 App. Type: ADV 29/03/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 11 Bridge Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, BLO 9AB
Proposal: 1 no. externally illuminated fascia sign; and 1 no. externally illuminated projecting sign
Application No.: $69074 \quad$ App. Type: LDCP 29/03/2023 Lawful Development
Location: 6 Ripon Hall Avenue, Ramsbottom, Bury, BLO 9RE
Proposal:

| Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed use permitting the occupation of the premises which |
| :--- |
| falls within use Class C3 (Dwellinghouse), and for the purpose of undertaking the |
| administrative functions of an app based private hire vehicle operator from a home office. |



Application No.: 69344 App. Type: FUL 14/04/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: Hey House, 1 Moorbottom Road, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL8 4NS
Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and Erection of two storey outbuilding with external staircase for use as garage/office
Application No.: 69373 App. Type: FUL 12/04/2023 Approve with Conditions
Location: 1 Downfield Close, Ramsbottom, Bury, BLO 9HN
Proposal: $\quad$ Raised patio at rear, steps to garden level and alterations to the garden.

Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Besses
Application No.: 68782 App. Type: FUL 15/03/2023 Approve with Conditions

Location: Car park of Vets Now Hospital, 98 Bury Old Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 6TQ
Proposal: Retention of single storey Portakabin building for use as a storage facility
Application No.: $69295 \quad$ App. Type: GPDE $13 / 03 / 2023$
Location: 23 Lancaster Avenue, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 6DX
Proposal:
Prior approval for proposed single storey rear extension
Application No.: $69316 \quad$ App. Type: FUL $06 / 04 / 2023$
Location: 45 Lower Moss Lane, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 6FA Refused

## Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Pilkington Park




| Application No.: $69362 \quad$ App. Type: FUL 05/04/2023 Approve with Conditions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 19 Ringley Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 7LD |
| Proposal: | First floor extension with juliet balcony at rear, Single storey extension at side, Obscured first <br> floor window at side |

## Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Unsworth

| Application | No.: | 69161 | App. Type: FUL | 17/03/2023 | Approve with Conditions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location: | 6 Blundell Close, Bury, BL9 8LH |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Two storey extension at rear; external alterations including change from garage door to window; alterations to existing windows and addition of window / door to side elevation |  |  |  |  |
| Application | No.: | 69283 | App. Type: FUL | 17/03/2023 | Approve with Conditions |
| Location: | 45 Randale Drive, Bury, BL9 8NF |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Front porch |  |  |  |  |
| Application | No.: | 69325 | App. Type: FUL | 24/03/2023 | Approve with Conditions |
| Location: | 32 Oakwell Drive, Bury, BL9 8LB |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Single storey side/rear extension and Conversion of garage into habitable room |  |  |  |  |
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| Wards Affected: | All listed |
| :--- | :--- |
| Scrutiny Interest: | N/A |

TRACKING/PROCESS
DIRECTOR:

| Chief Executive/ <br> Strategic Leadership <br> Team | Executive <br> Member/Chair | Ward Members | Partners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Scrutiny Committee | Committee | Council |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

This is a monthly report to the Committee of the Planning Appeals lodged against decisions of the authority and against Enforcement Notices served and those that have been subsequently determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

Attached to the report are the Inspectors Decisions and a verbal report will be presented to the Committee on the implications of the decisions on the Appeals that were upheld.

### 2.0 CONCLUSION

That the item be noted.

## List of Background Papers:-

## Contact Details:-

David Marno, Head of Development Management
Planning Services, Department for Resources and Regulation,
3 Knowsley Place, Bury BL9 0EJ

## Tel: 01612535291

Email: d.marno@bury.gov.uk

# Planning Appeals Lodged between 13/03/2023 and 16/04/2023 

Application No.: 69055/FUL
Decision level: DEL
Recommended Decision: Refuse

Appeal lodged: 11/04/2023
Appeal Type:

Applicant: Jess Blakesley
Location 509 Bury Old Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 3DE

Proposal Two storey front extension; Single storey side extension

Application No.: 69341/FUL
Decision level: DEL
Recommended Decision: Refuse

Appeal lodged: 05/04/2023
Appeal Type:

Applicant: Mr Lobenstein
Location 6 Mowbray Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0LP

Proposal Raising of roof ridge height with hip to gable roof extension, Loft conversion and Dormers at front and rear

[^0]
## Details of New Enforcement Appeals Lodged

 between 13/03/2023 and 16/04/2023Case Ref: 23/0012
Date of Appeal: 03/01/2023
Appeal Type: REP
Location: Land at side of 122 Venwood Road \& 16 River View Close, Prestwich
Issue: Breach of Condition no. 2 of Planning Approval 62489, not built in accordance with the approved drawings.

Total Number of Appeal Cases: 01


[^0]:    -Total Number of Appeals Lodged: 2

