

BURY COUNCIL
DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS, GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE
PLANNING SERVICES

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

01 September 2020

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Item:01 Land at George Street, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9WS Application No. 65327

Erection of synagogue (class D1) and offices (class B1) together with associated vehicular access and car parking

Nothing further to report

Item:02 31 Brookfield Avenue, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 5QH Application No. 65569

Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to residential care home (Class C2) with additional parking.

The applicant/agent has provided additional supporting information –

1. demonstrating GCSE results of child A, this is from hard work of the young person who has not been in any education for over a year since being with us he has engaged in work experience placements in a garage, art studio, he has had over 90% attendance in school and now he is going to college in September to study health and social care.
2. Receipt of a Bronze award from Unicef for Rights Respecting Schools, 4Pureheart are the only children's homes in the country to receive this award to date and they are currently working towards the silver award.
3. Feedback forms completed from qualified Social Workers (sensitive information having been redacted to protect identity) who have visited the other homes within the applicants' portfolio. To assist the company in improving their services and care they invite Social Workers to complete feedback forms and the attached are the outcome of this. They are mindful that to date Committee have only had sight of the one negative Ofsted Report from a couple of years back.
4. As series of photographs taken Wednesday 26th August at around 9am showing that parking ordinarily in the street is not out of the ordinary from other residential estates. The only cars parked on the road are those associated with and displaced by the permitted extension at number 29 Brookfield Avenue.

Unnamed Objector – Additional representation

Reiterates concerns regarding safety issues. Photographic evidence of a pavement bollard outside 31 Brookfield Avenue damaged and leaning over. As quoted from Civic choice .org.uk , pavement bollards are primarily used to protect a footway area from access by vehicles and as a parking control to prevent parking on the pavement itself, not as stated by the agent of 4pureheart ,to prevent damage to the property. As this damage could only have been caused by a vehicle of some sort it's proof traffic movement in this area is already unsafe.

Had a strong minded teenager with no parental guidance or indeed a small child playing, the damage caused would have been catastrophic. Bury Council cannot be seen to disregard a possible further teenage tragedy in the borough, when it could be avoided by simple relocation.

I say simple because 2 of these properties have been made available in the local area in the previous 9 months. Further to the evidence of problematic traffic movement we believe the parking issues 4pureheart have revised does not stand up to scrutiny regarding the measurements and the shift pattern provided.

The measurements seem to take away most of the garden play area and the shift pattern seems to indicate a person starting a shift at 7.45am would not be leaving work until 8.00am the following day surely that cannot be expected of an employee, therefore more shifts more employees, therefore more traffic.

The definite value of establishments such as this are without question, but they have to be in a safe environment, which this is not and I urge the committee to very carefully consider this application as a child's life can be determined by the decision whereas a safer location can be found. If a catastrophic accident should occur it could cause untold damage to the credibility of Bury Council and also the wider ranging populous of Ainsworth village. These points importantly determine a child's safety which as the council leader has stated "A child's safety is paramount".

Item:03 331 Bury Road, Tottington, Bury, BL8 3DS Application No. 65645
Change of use from post office with living accommodation to hairdressers (Class A1) on ground floor and self-contained dwelling to ground/first floor with access at rear;
Installation of new first floor window to side elevation

Publicity

Further objection received from No 333 Bury Road which raises the following issues:

- There are inaccuracies in the main report - the mistake is material and important to be rectified
- The existing ground floor window to No 331 is not obscure glazed - this does not overlook my kitchen. The existing 1st floor window is obscure glazed and this does look directly at my property.
- The proposed 1st floor window would look directly over the top of my boundary wall (which is only 6ft high) into my kitchen. A photograph has been provided.
- My kitchen window is the largest and not a secondary window in the kitchen.
- The room is 'habitable' as defined in part M of Building Regulations.
- Request the errors of the report are corrected.

Response to objector.

- To clarify, the existing ground floor window is not obscure glazed. The existing 1st floor window is obscure glazed and is located in the side gable of the 2 storey outtrigger to No 331 and serves a bathroom, where obscure glazing would be expected.
- The proposed 1st floor window would be towards the front of the gable end of No 331 where outlook would predominantly be to Bury Road and as such, views from the proposed 1st floor window to the kitchen window of No 333 would be oblique.
- A kitchen window is not classed as a habitable room window for the purposes of planning and in line with section 3.14 of adopted policy SPD6 which also states that less weight is afforded to habitable room windows in side elevations.
- It is therefore considered there would not be a significant or adverse impact from overlooking from the proposed window into the property of No 333 and as such is considered to be acceptable.

Objection received from No 30 Hilda Avenue with the following issues:

- The seven proposed spaces would provide severe restrictions to access to Bury Road and to the public right of way to the rear to the local nature trail. Plus other residents on the block need to use that area for parking, where would clients park? No space.
- What are the proposals for hazardous waste? There appears to be no provision/system for storing grey water to be then pumped away from the site. The drainage in that particular area is, presently, extremely poor. The proposal shows, that the shop drains directly into local authority sewer without prior interceptors for hazardous waste.
- Where is the proposal for trade waste? There is no trade waste storage annotated.
- Party wall and floor doesn't comply with building regs.
- No proposed sound insulation given to residential space.
- Severe fire risk: main access cannot go through the kitchen as proposed.
- Side window - too close to opposite gable.
- Significant changes to proposals would need to be made to ensure building regs are satisfied.

Response to objector

- Cars already park in a staggered arrangement along the gable of the property which has been verified by a site visit.
- There is adequate bin store provision in the rear yard area for the scale of the proposed use.
- Given the property would continue to operate as an A1 use and residential dwelling and that there would be no fundamental changes to layout or scale of development, it is considered the existing drainage would adequately serve the property.
- The application proposes to incorporate a soundproofing scheme to the party walls and floor to ceiling.
- The issues regarding the position of the windows have been covered above.