

BURY COUNCIL
DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS, GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE
PLANNING SERVICES

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

18 November 2025

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Item:01 Shore Top Farm, Kearsley Road, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1FA
Application No. 71888

Construction, operation and decommissioning of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facility and associated infrastructure

Extension of Time - Yes - 21/11/25

Nothing further to report

Item:02 Coach House, Knowsley View, Knowsley Road, Bolton, BL2 5PT
Application No. 72236

Change of use from coach house to 3 no. 2 bed apartments; Raising ridge height on existing extension; Single storey front extension; Single storey side extension.

Extension of Time - Yes 21/11/25

Consultations

Highways - No objection subject to conditions. A full Construction Traffic Management Plan is considered unnecessary for this development given the development involves conversion works with relatively minor alterations and additions. A condition would also be added to require the provision of the parking and cycle stores prior to occupation.

Conditions 18 and 19 added -

Condition 18

The development hereby approved shall not be commenced unless and until facilities for the storage of construction materials have been provided within the curtilage of the site. The facilities shall be retained for the intended purpose and the area identified shall not be used for any other purposes other than the storage of construction materials for the duration of the construction period.

Reason. To maintain the integrity of the adopted highway and ensure adequate off highway materials storage arrangements are provided for the duration of the construction period, in the interests of highway safety pursuant to policies EN1/2 and JP-C8.

Condition 19

The car parking, turning, cycle and bin storage facilities indicated on the approved plans shall be made available prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter maintained available for use at all times.

Reason. To ensure adequate car and cycle parking/storage and the storage and disposal of refuse within the curtilage of the site in the interests of highway safety pursuant to Policies EN1/2 and JP-C8.

Item:03 10 Chiltern Drive, Bury, BL8 1QY Application No. 72334

Change of use from residential property (Class C3) to Residential institutions - childrens home for 2 no children (Class C2)

Extension of Time - No
Policies

The following policies have been added:
JP-S4 - Flood Risk and Water Environment
EN7/3 - Water Pollution
EN7/5 - Waste Water Management

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic - Conditions requested in relation to the implementation of the proposed access and parking alterations and construction of the driveway in a porous/permeable material.

Conditions

Condition 5 added:

Notwithstanding the details shown on approved plan reference PL02 Rev B the driveway extension shall be constructed from porous or permeable materials.

Reason. To promote sustainable development and reduce flood risk pursuant to Development Plan Policies JP-S4 Flood Risk and Water Environment , 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.

Publicity

1 objection received in relation to:

- The revised plans now place the kitchen directly against the party wall shared with the lounge of the neighbouring property. This change introduces new concerns regarding noise transmission and disruption, particularly given the nature of kitchen activities and appliances.
- These houses were built in the 50s/60s and therefore are far from current standards for insulation, noise reduction etc.
- The staff changeover times mean there will be 4 adults and 2 children in the property early morning and in the evening.
- The properties on Chiltern Drive have floorboards, which means sound and vibration travel easily between homes.
- This new proposal to move the back door makes it highly likely that staff, residents and visitors will use the front door as the primary entrance and exit.
- If this is used as the main access to the property, I will experience multiple people coming and going, especially at hand over time, with 4 or sometimes 5 staff (if manager is present) all going in and out, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. This does not represent 'the normal activity of a family home' as described by the applicant.
- It is worth noting that most residents on this stretch of Chiltern Drive use their side or rear doors for access, as these are closer to the top of the drive and typically lead into the kitchen.
- The revised documentation suggests that the operational model of the proposed children's home is similar to that of a typical family dwelling. However, this is not an accurate reflection of the reality. Unlike a family unit, the property will experience regular activity involving multiple individuals, including staff members, family visitors, and professionals.
- In the Highways and parking statement, it is stated that 'the operational intensity of use is comparable to a large family dwelling'. These bungalows on Chiltern Drive are small 2 bedroom properties, homes to mainly retired couples or single very elderly occupants, they are not family dwellings.
- The revised site plan shows parking for three cars; however, the representation appears to use artistic license and is not drawn to scale. It does not accurately reflect the steepness or narrowness of the existing driveway. The application states that there is independent access for three vehicles, this is incorrect.

- Currently, the property has gates at the top of the drive, and at most, only one car can be parked on the steep incline.
- The application also states that the onsite parking is sufficient to accommodate the operational model. This is inaccurate. The documentation details two staff members on site at all times, with shift changeovers occurring between 8:00–8:20am and 8:00–8:20pm. Additionally, a manager is present from 9:00am–5:00pm. This means that during hand over periods, up to four vehicles may be present simultaneously, this could be 5 if the manager is required to meet with staff on hand over.
- In winter months, these driveways become particularly hazardous due to snow and ice, making parking on them unsafe. All the driveways have a fence, steps or handrails to support safe access, particularly during the winter months.
- The revised plans do not show the junction at the entrance to the estate, which is one of only two access points for Walshaw Park.
- It is reasonable to estimate that around 250–260 vehicles could be using this junction during peak times.
- Have planners/highway officers viewed the property against plans submitted to confirm accuracy? Is it feasible to park a car in the proposed 3rd garden space by using the existing drop kerb? Will this space be able to be accessed via the drop kerb if there are already 2 cars parked on the existing driveway?
- The operational model suggests there will be a hand over of staff between 8am-8.30am, this will potentially mean 4 vehicles being manoeuvred on a busy junction. The morning hand over will be at one of the busiest times of the day when large groups of children are walking to school
- Photographs submitted showing the driveway and children crossing roads, waiting for friends, and riding cycles in an around the vicinity of the site.

1 objection from Councillor Wright received in relation to:

- This is NOT a detached property as stated in reports , it is a small semi detached bungalow situated near a very busy junction and daily pickup / drop off area for many pupils of Elton High School.
- My objection is regarding the parking provision , a steep tandem drive not practical for many daily movements which will be required with shift changeovers . To use the front garden area as another parking spot as suggested would be totally impractical on such a steep gradient .
- This property is not suitable for the proposed use and should be refused .

Response to representations

Should the dwelling be retained in C3 use the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would not be able to intervene in terms of internal layout. The internal layout proposed could be implemented by any future resident, or the existing rooms utilised in a way that best fits their needs and as such this would not warrant refusal of the scheme.

In terms of alterations, the attached property has existing front and rear dormers and a single storey rear extension. No. 20 Chiltern Drive also has front and rear dormers. No. 170 Cotswold Crescent (2 doors away) also has a rear dormer. Within a row of just 8no. properties, including the site a number of dwellings have had alterations and extensions that have the potential to increase the occupancy beyond the existing/original 2no. bed layout. Any future occupiers of No. 10 Chiltern Drive would also have the ability to extend their dwelling, in a number of ways utilising Permitted Development Rights outside of the control of the LPA as their neighbours have done.

Similarly, whilst the representations state that most residents use their side door,

there would be no way for the LPA to enforce that a certain access/exit is used particularly when any future resident/s of the dwelling if it was retained in C3 use would be free to use the front door as and when they so please. The LPA would also not be able to restrict visitors to a C3 use, for say care needs for any future occupiers and would not be able to set out how many times, or when they can/cannot visit or the days on which they can attend.

Many residential properties, set on residential estates have occupants of dwellings that require carers, nurses, social workers etc to attend on an as needed basis. In terms of the use, there is also the fallback position that the applicant could implement this, or a similar use without the need for Planning Permission. Supporting this approach, an Inspector issued a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for the use of a house in Leicestershire as a children's home (appeal reference APP/K2420/X/11/2155849), finding that although the proposal would involve a change from C3 to C2 use, no material change of use was involved. The parties agreed that the lawful use was as a dwelling house in Use Class C3 of the Use Classes Order. It was proposed to operate it as a care home for children and young people between the ages of 9 and 17 with learning disabilities. The home would provide care for up to three children, administered by non-resident care staff working in shifts which would reflect the proposal brought before Planning Control Committee.

The Inspector noted that the North Devon judgment provided the authority with the view that use as a care home for children, where carers were non-resident, fell within Use Class C2. He then considered whether the change of use was material. In refusing an LDC staff numbers were cited by the Council as the sole cause for concern in this judgment. However, having looked at the numbers involved; the Inspector concluded that they were not materially different from what might be expected of a large family house. On this basis he concluded that the proposed use would not, as a use within Use Class C2, amount to a material change of use from Use Class C3 as a dwelling house. This case law detailed above is a material consideration in any Use Class C2 applications that are submitted both as LDCs and for full planning permission.

Representations have also questioned the parking proposed, and whether this is sufficient for the operation of the proposed use. This has already been addressed within the main report the parking at the site would exceed the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 11 (SPD11) in terms of the number of spaces required. As also set out PfE Policy JP-C8 requires new development to be located and designed to enable and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use and to reduce the negative effects of car dependency. As such, the LPA would not seek to increase the parking at the property over and above the requirements of SPD 11. Cycle parking is proposed at the site to encourage cycling to the site for staff members. The existing drive/hardstanding to side of the existing property, if the gate were removed is shown to be wider than 2.5 metres and therefore could be utilised to park 3no. cars off street if required for either the existing or proposed use.

Planning permission is not required to introduce additional hardstanding to the fronts of properties provided that the materials used are porous/permeable and this has been conditioned. The access is not located on a classified road.

Access to the driveway remains unaltered and whether it is a C2 or C3 use the users of the driveway would have to reverse off the driveway. Whilst acknowledged that the access is not optimal, anyone occupying the dwelling could also create a similar level of demand for access as the proposed C2 use at the scale proposed. Due to the

concerns raised however a condition has been introduced to limit the number of children that can be accommodated at the site to a maximum of 2. This limitation would not be possible if the site was retained in a purely C3 use.

In the above circumstances and highlighted various occupancies that could be undertaken at the property, it is not considered that the proposal would have unacceptable impacts on highway safety that would warrant or sustain an objection to the application. The access and parking arrangements remain unaltered from the existing use. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The red edge plan, submitted with the application clearly depicts the property as a semi-detached property. This was also confirmed on site by the Case Officer. The assessment of the property has therefore been based on a semi-detached, not detached property.

Item:04 Land to rear of 69 Sandy Lane/Lowther Court, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9PS Application No. 71784

Demolition of existing garages and erection of 2 no. dwellings

Extension of Time - Yes 21st November 2025

1 objection received in relation to:

- When the flats were built the tarmac area was left unfinished.
- Landowner would need to excavate existing car park to install services.
- Large drop to rear of garages that they plan to demolish which would leave the development in a high-risk safety category. Residents are highly skeptical whether this work would be completed properly and any damage rectified.

Response to objections

As confirmed within the main committee report land ownership issues are non-material planning considerations not relevant to the decision.

The application would need to be completed, in accordance with the approved plans. Any damage that may be caused would be a private issue between landowners/neighbours and not relevant to the planning decision.