

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 02/06/2025	Ref: 71820/PIP
Registration: 15/04/2025	LDfC: 05/05/2025	Expiry Date: 20/05/2025
Site Visit: 17/04/2025	Site Notice: 17/04/2025	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 7	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Permission in principle for 6 no. dwellings

Location: Land adjacent to Manor House, Long Lane, Bury, BL9 5QT

Description

The site is a vacant and overgrown piece of land which is located at the end of Long Lane, approximately 270m from Walmersely Road. The site is located in the Green Belt, Landscape Character Area and River Valley. The application form states the site is 0.18 hectares.

Directly to the south next to the site is a hamlet of dwellings, running the length of the eastern boundary of the site is Long Lane from which there is an access drive which follows the north and western boundaries of the site and which leads to a couple of the properties within this residential settlement.

The applicant seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for 6 no. dwellings. A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing - led development.

The PiP consent has two stages. The first stage, the Permission in Principle establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second stage is the Technical Details Consent when detailed development proposals are assessed.

The submission of a valid PiP application requires a completed application form, plan which identifies the land to which the application relates and the correct fee.

There are no other detail or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP.

A decision must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan and material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

To assess PiP applications, an Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) consideration is limited to location, land use and amount of development, with other matters considered at technical details stage.

Local Planning Authorities consult anybody that would be required to be consulted in relation to an application for planning permission but matters relating to ecology, landscaping, contamination, design, transport/highways and heritage are considered in a Stage 2 Technical Details application. Any responses received can be included as informatives notes to advise the applicant of the requirements at a technical details stage.

Conditions cannot be attached to a PiP.

Relevant Planning History

N/a

Publicity

DELEGATED REPORT

Letters sent to 14 properties on 16/4/25
Site notice posted 17/4/25

7 objections received with the following comments -

- This is Green Belt not Grey Belt land.
- The lane is not suitable for heavy traffic.
- Inadequate services not meeting need of current residence.
- The road floods in heavy rain and there is no drainage
- The lane would be compromised for existing residents during any constructions
- Wildlife and animals are on the site which are protected - Bats, owls , red squirrel, great crested newts, deer, pheasants.
- Badgers have setts down in the valley and they come up onto the road at night
- The buildings here are on the footprint of existing structures.
- There is a pond on the land and the application was on the Council's planning application site but has since been removed and no evidence of the planning decision is available to view
- Impact on peace and quiet
- Affect the landscape and Spoil views
- All new services would need to be provided or upgraded.
- Long Lane buildings are on the council's draft local List of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. Para 197 of the NPPF states that the effect on a NDHA should be taken into account.
- There is also an underground passage from Manor View (original Pigsden Farmhouse) basement which is believed to have been a Priest Tunnel from the local Christchurch this proposal could disturb this structure.
- There is a section of land at the entrance to the lane which would be more suitable for any planning.
- There are only 5 homeowners on the lane, other properties are owned by the applicant and this reduces the no of comments to the application..
- The NPPF (Section 137) states that: "The essential characteristics of Green Belt are openness and its permanence."
- Loss of privacy and loss of natural light
- Overlooking into my garden and house
- The development would have an immediate effect towards the low density culture of the area
- Adding 6 families would cause noise pollution
- The Council have already met its housing target requirements for the next 5 years. Developing the site would not alleviate the housing crisis but would undermine the Green Belt's purpose
- Fly tipping occurs at the top part of the road
- Suffer with bin related issues - the road would not withstand larger trucks
- Better sites elsewhere
- The land in question plays a crucial role as a 'buffer zone' between the privately owned housing and the "Green belt" area.
- Development of up to these 6 houses will have substantial increase in density to the area which will likely alter the current environment significantly with increased traffic, noise, and foot traffic, transforming the area from its current quiet, residential character to a more urbanized, busier environment.
- Wildlife corridor - NPPF states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.
- Fences will encroach on the openness of the Green Belt perimeter.
- This specific site will be used for capitalism, and will cause further encroachment to unnecessary Greenbelt.

Revised description for 6 no dwellings.
Neighbours re-notified on 15/5/25.

DELEGATED REPORT

3 objections received with the following comments -

- Loss of privacy and natural light
- More impact on the surroundings
- Noise detriment to wildlife and will disturb their habitat
- This is Green belt not Grey belt
- There is no drainage on the lane and it often floods
- Extra traffic
- Disruption to neighbours
- Damage and mud to the lane
- Noise and light pollution from these properties
- The farm is a heritage asset and should not be degraded due to new buildings
- There are already approx 6 new developments ongoing within 2 1/2 miles, with no additional schools being planned.
- Overlooking into private areas of my home/garden
- Worth noting there was an application for 'Centre of Pond 30m from Pleasant View' on 25/1/21. There is now no evidence of this on the Council's website. . I would like an explanation to why this has been removed by someone in development control as a foot print is suppose to be able to be identified in any form of building application?
- Bury has met its 5 year housing supply - This index does not refer to as far as I can see Holcombe Gardens Bury New Road Ramsbottom or Spring Meadow Whalley Road Shuttleworth.
- Fly tipping problems in the area
- A more logical site would be Walmersley Road
- The land plays a crucial buffer between privately owned housing and the Green Belt
- The function of Grey belt is also to prevent urban sprawl
- Development for 6 houses would substantially increase density in the area and alter significantly alter the environment.
- The neighbourhood is of a quiet suburban character - significant environmental damage would be caused.
- No evidence of how biodiversity or natural habitats would be mitigated.
- The concept of openness is a core principle of Green Belt.
- New buildings would obscure and disrupt the NDHA.
- Approving this could set a precedent for future development and a gradual transformation of the area.
- Long lane is not capable of any more traffic
- The current utilities cannot even support the existing development.
- Will affect my well-being
- I moved here to escape neighbours and high traffic noise - there will be detrimental impacts on the environment, wildlife, pollution
- All the dwellings here have been built on the footprint of other buildings - there has never been any structure on the area of Green Belt land.
- An underground passage from Manor View (original Pigsden Farmhouse) basement which is believed to have been a Priest Tunnel from the local Christchurch this proposal could disturb this structure.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No comments received.

Waste Management - No response received

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No response received

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objection in principle

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objection in principle

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objection in principle

GMCA - Minerals and Waste consultations - No objection in principle

Conservation Officer - No objection

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework

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), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within 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 and PfE Policies 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.

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, it is 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 material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Principle

The Permission in Principle (PiP) application seeks to establish whether in principle, the site is suitable for a residential development for 6 no dwellings.

Consideration of PiP applications are limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

Consultations on the planning application can be carried out but conditions cannot be attached to a PiP approval.

The issues to establish acceptance of the proposed PiP development are analysed below.

Land use and location

Green Belt

The application site falls within the Green Belt as designated under PfE policy JP-G9.

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF is clear that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it meets the listed exceptions. The proposal does not meet any of the exceptions listed within paragraph 154.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that the development of homes in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a) The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b) There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;

- c) The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
- d) Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

Grey belt is defined by the NPPF as "land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development."

The application site does not impact assets referred to in footnote 7. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to any purposes (a), (b) or (d) of paragraph 143.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that Green Belt serves 5 purposes, and those of relevance are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; and
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Planning guidance published on 27th February 2025 for assessing a site against these purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision making (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl

The site is near to the built-up area of Walmersley. The development would not result in an incongruous pattern of development and the site is already subject to urbanising influences by way of being located adjacent to the existing homes at Manor House/Former Pigsden Farm. Therefore, it is considered that the site makes a moderate contribution toward Purpose (a).

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighbouring towns merging

The guidance specifies this is in reference to the merging of towns, not villages. The site does not form a substantial gap between the towns of Ramsbottom and Bury, nor would it result in visual separation of the towns. The site would be able to be developed without the loss of visual separation due to the existence of the existing adjacent development at Manor House/Former Pigsden Farm. As such it is considered that the site makes a moderate-weak contribution toward purpose (b).

As the site does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes (a) or (b), the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land. However, for the proposal to be considered as not inappropriate development it must satisfy all of the criterion, a to c, listed in NPPF paragraph 155.

Criterion A Considering the impact on the remaining Green Belt in the plan area

This criterion requires that the development would not fundamentally undermine, the purposes, when taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. The guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 64-008-20250225) adds that in reaching this judgement, authorities should consider whether, or the extent to which, the release or development of Green Belt land would affect the ability of all the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in a meaningful way.

The only other Green Belt purpose which would be breached by the proposal is Purpose C safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as the development would represent an irreversible encroachment of built form into the countryside. However, the area to be lost is

small in relation to the totality of the remaining Green Belt land both in the local area, and the wider plan area. The site is adjacent to a small 'hub' of existing homes at Manor House/Former Pigsden Farm and open undeveloped fields would continue to both surround the community at the former farm and separate the development from Walmersley. Consequently, the overall effect on the countryside would be limited.

Therefore, it is considered that the development of the site in principle, which represents a small part of this parcel, would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Criterion B Demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

This criterion requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need, which in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, means:

- A lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or
- Where the Housing Delivery Test is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

Five-year supply

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant under-delivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

- 246 homes per year from 2022-2025;
- 452 homes per year from 2025-2030; then
- 520 homes per year from 2030-2039.

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 deliverable land supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed. The joint Places for Everyone Plan allocates significant strategic sites for housing within Bury and will accelerate housing delivery within the Borough to meet housing needs.

Following the adoption of Places for Everyone, the Council is able to demonstrate a deliverable 5-year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

Housing Delivery Test

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), 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%) 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 (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that

Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

Paragraph 11(d) 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, provide a strong 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, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

In this case, the site is located within the Green Belt so therefore paragraph 11 (d)(i) applies and the proposal needs to be assessed against Green Belt policies. The latest published HDT result for Bury also means that NPPF paragraph 155(b) is triggered, and there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

Criterion C Sustainable location

NPPF paragraph 155(c) requires consideration of whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework.

Paragraph 110 states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support the sustainable transport objectives in paragraph 109. Development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 115 states that development should ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised and safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Green Belt guidance (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 64-011-20250225) also states that when making decisions regarding planning applications on grey belt land, authorities should ensure that the development would be in a sustainable location.

The site is within 300m of Walmersley Road and the services within Walmersley including public transport, a post office, primary school and shops. As such, the site is considered to be in a sustainable location adjoining the existing built up area, with access to public transport and a range of services. Therefore this requirement is met.

Amount of development

Housing

Type, Size and Design of New Housing

PfE Policy JP-H3 - Seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes. PfE Policy JP-H3 also requires all new dwellings to 1. comply with the nationally described space standards and 2. be built to the 'accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. These requirements will need to be secured by condition to ensure they are met at the Technical Details stage.

Density

NPPF paragraph 130 seeks to ensure the efficient use of land, and to avoid homes being built at low densities.

PfE Policy JP-H4 requires new housing development to be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land and high-quality design. Policy JP-H4 sets out minimum densities that should be considered. The site falls in an area where a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare should be had regard to.

The site area is 0.18 hectares, therefore 6 dwelling equates to 33 dwellings per hectare; 35 dwellings per hectare would equate to 6.3 (rounded to 6) dwellings, therefore a proposal for 6 dwellings would comply with Policy JP-H4.

Conclusion

The site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land and is considered to be 'not inappropriate' in accordance with NPPF paragraph 155 criteria a-c.

As the site falls within this definition, in accordance with paragraph 11 (d)(i), the 'tilted balance' applies.

NPPF paragraph 155(d) and the 'Golden Rules' are considered not to be applicable in this case, because the application is not for major development.

The amount of development proposed is in accordance with the density requirements set out in PfE Policy JP-H4 and is considered acceptable.

Therefore, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

Consultee responses and considerations for a Technical Details Consent

Landscape Character

The site is within the River Irwell (north Bury) and Kirklees Landscape Character Area (LCA 23), an incised urban fringe valley as assessed by the GM Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment. The impact of the type and broad quantum of development on the site and the effect on the visual receptors are the key aspects under consideration at this stage however, consideration of the impact of the layout, massing, design and scale at the technical details stage upon the LCA will be essential.

The Irwell Valley area is characterised by narrow wooded incised valleys, some having a strong sense of seclusion and relative tranquillity, contrasting with surrounding densely populated urban areas. The overall character is influenced by a complex mix of land uses such as traditional farming practices and industrial sites. Some areas are strongly influenced by the visual presence of the adjoining urban edge and by numerous tall pylon lines and major road and rail routes which cross and run along the valleys.

No information has been submitted regarding the landscape or visual impact of the development. The development would result in up to 6 new homes at Long Lane, where there are currently approximately 8 dwellings. As such, the sensitivity of the immediate area to change is low and the residual landscape character effect up to 6 new homes contained within the site and not spilling into the surrounding fields is, in principle, considered to be weak. Albeit the impact of the layout, massing, design and scale at the technical details stage will be critical.

Highways

No comments received.

At a technical details stage, details of access and improvement works would be expected. The site would be accessed via a single lane cul-de-sac more than 250m long and therefore Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue service would need to be consulted on a Technical Details application.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The proposal is required to provide a 10% gain in Biodiversity in accordance with both the provisions of the Environment Act 2021, and PfE Policy JP-G8.

Carbon and Energy

The proposal is required to comply with Policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy. Details on what measures the applicants intended to put in place to comply with this policy will be required to be submitted at the Stage 2, Technical Details consent stage.

Digital Connectivity

The proposal is required to comply with Policy JP-C2: Digital Connectivity. Confirmation will need to be sought at the Stage 2, Technical Details consent stage that full fibre will be provided as part of the proposal.

Active Travel

Policy JP-C1 - An Integrated Network requires developments to be located and designed to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport.

Developments should prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Consideration should be given to providing pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to ensure that there is safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle access to the proposed development.

Details on what measures the applicants intended to put in place to comply with this policy will be required to be submitted at the Stage 2, Technical Details consent stage

Heritage

The development to the south on Long Lane is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset and as such a Heritage Statement would be required at the Technical details stage.

The site is also on the Historic Environment Record (HER) and would require the submission of a Desk Top Study at the Technical details stage.

Ecology

GMEU are not aware of any ecological issues associated with this site that would prevent planning permission being granted though this is most likely owing to a lack of survey effort. Given however its small size and development history, GMEU would also regard it as very unlikely that there would be any ecological issue that would prevent permission being granted.

GMEU would recommend that as part of any technical details stage a preliminary ecological appraisal and biodiversity net gain statement is provided.

United Utilities response

Should this proposal be approved, and a further application submitted for Technical Detail Consent, it is important to note that our response to a subsequent application will be based upon the information that is available at the time of response, and therefore, our position and advice may vary.

UU strongly recommend that the applicant or any subsequent developer contacts United Utilities, using the pre-development enquiry service to discuss their proposals directly with our Developer Services team. They can find further advice, along with a pre-development enquiry form, on our website: Building & Developing - United Utilities Alternative ways to contact the team are available in the Appendix, Section 4.0 'Contacts'.

UU strongly encourage all developments to include sustainable drainage systems to help manage surface water and to offer new opportunities for wildlife to flourish.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance

(NPPG) advise that surface water from new developments should be investigated and delivered in the following order of priority:

1. into the ground (infiltration);
2. to a surface water body;
3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
4. to a combined sewer.

Should the applicant receive Planning in Principle permission for this proposal, United Utilities will review the drainage element of any application for Technical Detail Consent in line with the surface water hierarchy. United Utilities will request evidence that the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and why more sustainable options are not achievable before a surface water connection to the public sewer is considered acceptable.

Greater Manchester Mineral and Waste

The Greater Manchester Minerals Plan (adopted 2013) forms part of Bury's Development Plan and sets out policies relating to minerals, including the safeguarding of mineral resources.

The proposed development is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sandstone, surface coal and brick clay and therefore Greater Manchester Minerals Plan Policy 8 - Prior Extraction of Mineral Resources Within Mineral Safeguarding Areas is relevant. This policy seeks to protect mineral resources from sterilisation by other forms of development. Policy 8 sets out a number of exemptions (criteria i-viii) for when the safeguarding policy is not relevant, but none apply here. Policy 8 sets out that proposals for non-mineral development within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas that do not allow for the prior extraction of minerals will only be permitted in certain circumstances (criteria 1 - 4). The application does not appear to make any reference to safeguarded minerals or Policy 8.

It is noted however that the proposed development site is relatively small and constrained by proximity to existing dwellings and an existing road. It is therefore unlikely that prior extraction of any mineral would be feasible in this case.

Contaminated Land response

The site is land associated with the former Pigsden Farm and the boundary of the site is within a registered landfill as such there is the potential for contamination to be present. The landfill is understood to be unlicensed but approved under planning c1986 for the tipping of skip waste to construct a roadway to the farmhouse. The area of tipping extends wider than the current Long Lane. Furthermore, a sensitive end use is proposed. As such, to avoid pre-commencement conditions sufficient information must be submitted at Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, to demonstrate that no remedial measures are required or to agree such measures. Further information regarding Land Contamination and the planning process can be found on the Planning Portal, with information on the likely assessments required to be undertaken and submitted.

Air quality

For this type of development, it would be expected that parking would be included. The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Due to the scale of the proposed development, it is considered very unlikely that the proposed development could create an increase of more than 500 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the EPUR Guidance, an air quality assessment will not be required.

Bury Council has been identified by DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. To support the principles of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan in reducing levels of nitrogen dioxide and in order to manage current and future levels of air pollution Bury Council is encouraging the use of cleaner vehicles. As such and in line the requirements of the Building Regulations (The Building Regulations 2010, Approved Document S, Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles), as part of the Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, the developer should provide information regarding

DELEGATED REPORT

Electric Vehicle Infrastructure to the following specification:

- 1 no. electric vehicle (EV) charging point (minimum 7kW*) per dwelling/parking space.

*Mode 3, 7kW (32A) single phase, or 22kW (32A) three phase, and for 50kW Mode 4 rapid charging may be required. British Standard BS EN 61851-1:2019 to be used.

Further information regarding minimum standards can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/transport/low-emission-and-electric-vehicles>.

Certification and photographic evidence of the installation of the agreed electric vehicle charge points will be required to be submitted to Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the development being brought into use. The infrastructure shall be maintained and operational in perpetuity.

Response to objections

- The scope of a PiP is restricted to a consideration of the principle only. The site has been assessed above as Grey Belt and as such the principle of development is accepted.
- Many of the issues raised including ecology, access, traffic, drainage, heritage and impacts on amenity from overlooking, privacy etc would be assessed within any technical details application.
- The application for the pond referred to above was the submission of a snap shot of an application on the 1app.planningportal.co.uk site. There is no record of this on the LPA's system or the Council's mapping system. Regardless, it is considered that the pond or an application/approval for a pond within the site area is irrelevant and would not effect an approval for a permisison in principle for a residential development.

Recommendation: Approve

Conditions and Reasons:

The Principle of Permission hereby granted is for a period of 3 years from the date of this decision. This is the prescribed period as set out in the Town & Country Planning Act 199, Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 as amended. The "Notes to Applicant" below provides guidance on what the detailed proposals should include at the Technical Details Stage.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT 2/6/25		DM 2/6/25	