



Supporting Statement for Planning Application Ref 71000

Erection of 17 no. small light industrial units with associated servicing
and car parking

Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe

May 2025

Contents

- 1. Introduction.....3
- 2. Changes from the Original Application..... 4
- 3. Responses to Statutory Consultees5

Appendices

Appendix A	Updated Site Layout Plan
Appendix B	Updated Landscape Plan
Appendix C	Transport Note 2

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The applicant, Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd owns the estate known as Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe. A planning application was submitted in July 2024 to form 17no. new build small light industrial units on an unused portion of the site in the north east. A number of queries and requests for further information have been requested from Bury Planning Authority since the original application was made.
- 1.2 This document aims to respond to the queries raised and clarify any changes to the application documents from the original application.
- 1.3 There is supplementary documentation enclosed at the Appendices to assist in the understanding of the supporting information provided by the applicant in response to the various queries and comments raised by statutory consultees.

2. Changes from the Original Application

2.1 In summary, there have been minimal changes to the original application although certain aspects have been supported with further information where required. These are summarised below:-

1.	The site plan has been updated from 3672-02A Proposed Site Plan Planning A3 to the latest site plan which is 3672-02c Proposed Site Plan. This has added a key for the parking spaces with new spaces added for disabled, cycles, two wheeled motor vehicles (TWMV's) and also identifying space for waste collection. There have been no other changes to the layout of the scheme or to the buildings themselves. This updated site layout plan can be seen at appendix A.
2.	The landscape layout submitted was 5575.01 Rev D. This had been updated to align with the ecologists Preliminary Ecological Assessment and BNG assessment as Rev E but it would appear that this was not submitted to the LPA. The landscaping layout has subsequently been updated to align with the latest architects site layout plan and is enclosed with this supporting statement at appendix B. It is drawing 5575.01 Rev F.
3.	There has been a Transport Note 2 prepared which responds to the Local Highway Authority initial comments however, other than demonstrating that the layout works with supplementary tracking layouts, there have been no fundamental changes to the scheme other than those outlined at item 1 above and which have been incorporated on to the latest architects site layout plan. The TN2 document is attached at appendix C.

3. Responses to Statutory Consultees

Biodiversity Net Gain

3.1 Statutory Consultees Comments - The BNG report and metric demonstrate that the proposals will result in a net loss of biodiversity with the trading rules of the metric being broken. No information has been provided on how these losses will be addressed. The applicants have therefore not demonstrated that the general condition on BNG, which is attached to all relevant planning permissions, can be discharged and further information is required.

3.2 *Applicants Response - We have confirmed during exchanges with the planning officer that we have provided you with what you need in order to condition the consent with an obligation on the applicant to acquire the necessary units for offsite compliance. The comment from our ecological consultant is as follows:-*

BNG cannot be achieved within the site, and our report and also your correspondence with the council has clearly stated that you intend to buy biodiversity units from a habitat bank to achieve the 10% BNG. This is in compliance with the biodiversity net gain legislation and rules. You therefore have demonstrated that the BNG condition can be discharged and have stated how.

3.3 Statutory Consultees Comments - In addition, the metric claims that the line of trees on the site will be enhanced to become a species rich hedgerow with trees. However, the only hedge species to be planted on the landscaping plan is beech and would not therefore be a species rich hedge, besides not being native to Bury.

3.4 *Applicants Response - Somehow a previous version (D) of the landscaping plan had been submitted. The landscape plan rev E which does identify species rich hedgerow which has been checked by our ecological consultant was submitted to the planning officer during the application process. Please note that this has now been updated to Rev F in order to align with the latest architects site layout although no landscaping / vegetation has changed.*

Other Biodiversity issues

3.5 Statutory Consultees Comments - The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies one tree that has moderate bat roosting potential and that if it is affected by the proposals further surveys would be required. It is not clear if this tree is impacted by the proposal. Clarification is therefore required and if the tree is impacted, the surveys should be undertaken **prior to the determination of the application.**

3.6 *Applicants Response - We can confirm that this tree is far outside the proposed development even when taking into account the crown of the tree. It is going to remain and will not be affected by the development at all. We will also plan to use this for appropriate bird boxes.*

3.7 Statutory Consultees Comments - Notwithstanding the above issues, the Appraisal makes precautionary recommendations to protect species during any construction works. These include nesting birds, amphibians, bats and hedgehogs. The Council's Ecology advisors advise that these measures be included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity and the following condition be attached to any permission, should it be granted:

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority

3.8 *Applicants Response - It is agreed that a CEMP can be a condition on the planning approval.*

3.9 Statutory Consultees Comments - A management plan for the proposed treatment of Japanese knotweed has been submitted with the application. Its implementation could be secured by condition

3.10 *Applicants Response - It is agreed that a condition on the planning approval is acceptable. It is worth noting that the implementation of the management plan has commenced.*

- 3.11 Statutory Consultees Comments - The Appraisal also make recommendation for enhancement measures for species, which are not included with biodiversity net gain. As the recommended bird boxes do not appear to have been included in the landscaping plan, the Council's Ecologists advise that the following condition, or similar, be attached to any permission:

A scheme for the bird boxes, as set out in section 5.2 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report by Elton Ecology dated 14 July 2024 (ref: P2582_01), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development (or in accordance with a phasing plan which shall first be agreed in writing with the local planning authority) and shall be retained thereafter

- 3.12 *Applicants Response - It is agreed that a condition on the planning approval is acceptable.*

Parking and Highway Safety matters

- 3.13 Statutory Consultees Comments - The Council considers the site to be over-developed and highly constrained:

- Loss of car parking provision to accommodate the development – there is no justification within the submission discussing the impact of losing car parking spaces would impact on businesses within the wider business park. Also, having visited the application site and driven through and around Eton Hill Business Park, most units had two cars parked in front of them. No justification has been provided for not providing two parking spaces outside each of the units when it is clear from the rest of the business park that car parking is predominant on this business park. Notably, the submitted Transport Note has determined the level of car parking provision incorrectly.
- Car Parking Provision is insufficient. The submitted Transport Note states 12 spaces are to be provided. TfGM suggest 12 new spaces is not enough but divert to the LHA.

SPD 11: Parking advises under at least 16 parking spaces should be provided for a development of this size, under 5b). In addition, 2 disabled car parking spaces are required, at least 2 spaces for Two-wheel motorised vehicles – your client will know if the specific existing site use suggests more. The provision for Two Wheel motorised vehicle parking provision is required to be covered and secure.

Notwithstanding the SPD requirements, having seen the car parking demand on the wider site, the LPA considers each unit should be provided with at least one vehicle parking space per unit, preferably two spaces, along with providing separate car parking provision for visitors and delivery vehicles.

- The Council points you to the provide two car parking spaces per unit and separate parking provision for visitors and vans making deliveries to the proposed units.
- Access for the Fire Service is not achievable – see their response online and section below.
- Lack of Waste Management details and no refuse collection area. Refuse collection wagons are all larger than the large van tracking which has been undertaken. Please provide both tracking details for the refuse collection vehicle, a Waste Management Statement and the plans will need to be amended to provide a sufficiently sized refuse collection area.
- The LPA notes that the Proposed Site Plan does not have a key, therefore it is unclear how many car parking spaces are actually proposed. It seems to me that the Transport Note may not correspond with the submitted Proposed Site Plan.
- Please also address all of the comments and recommendations made by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

3.14 *Applicants Response - Please see attached in appendix C the TN2 updated transport note 2 prepared by Tetra Tech which we believe covers all of these queries / comments raised and which has been submitted to the planning officer during the application process.*

Fire Safety

3.15 Statutory Consultees Comments - Please see the response from Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue attached. As it stands the site and its lack of access for a fire engine would render the site unsafe for future occupants. The application cannot be supported on this basis.

As a minimum vehicular tracking needs to be provided to demonstrate the fire service can enter and leave the site in a fire engine and access all proposed units, and a water hydrant needs to be provided close to the site

3.16 *Applicants Response - Please see attached in appendix C the TN2 updated transport note 2 prepared by Tetra Tech which we believe covers all of these queries / comments raised and which has been submitted to the planning officer during the application process.*

Design and Layout

3.17 Statutory Consultees Comments - For all the above reasons, the Council considers the site as submitted to be over-developed, highly constrained, and unsafe, contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and UDP policies EN1/2 which seek well-designed and accessible places. The number of units proposed and layout of the units need to be re-considered.

- 3.18 *Applicants Response - Please see attached in appendix C the TN2 updated transport note 2 prepared by Tetra Tech which we believe covers all of these queries / comments raised and which has been submitted to the planning officer during the application process.*

Drainage/ United Utilities (UU's)

- 3.19 Statutory Consultees Comments - Please find attached UU's recommendations. Whilst they have advised a condition, it would be prudent to furnish UU/ the LPA with the drainage plan United Utilities has requested. It will be in your client's interest to provide this as part of this application, as he needs to be sure that their requirements are met given the site wants to drain to their infrastructure.

- 3.20 *Applicants Response - We have received the following comments from our drainage engineers:-*


This is a typical standard UU letter. There is no reference to the document submitted with the original planning application namely 'Sustainable Drainage Strategy' prepared by LK Group Reference FRA241048 dated July 2024 (which rules out infiltration based upon the tests done previously on site so would deal with part i) of the UU letter) nor any reference (acceptance or otherwise) to the drainage solution we have put forward.

They do require a detailed drainage design – which we can do but normally would do that after approval of the strategy / principle and would expect this to be conditioned.

We respectfully request that the LPA ask UU to comment on the drainage strategy and approve in principle? And to condition the submission of a detailed drainage design?


Appendix A

Updated Site Layout Plan



Parking Schedule for development of 5,950 sq ft B2 use

- 1.New dedicated parking spaces for units(17No total)
- 2.New disabled parking spaces (2No in total)
- 3.Spaces lost to make way for the new development (7No in total)
- 4.Replacement spaces for those lost (6No in total)
- 5.2no cycle spaces
- 6.2No TWMV spaces
- 7.Suggesed waste collection areas



Hamilton Heath Estates
Eton Business Park
Radcliffe
Eton Hill Road
Bury

Site Plan as Proposed SK01

work to figured dimensions

© CJ Partnership owns the copyright of this design / drawing which must not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of CJ Partnership

contract no
3672

drawn by

drawing no
02

date
January 2024

revision
C

scale @ A3
1:1000

planning

Revisions:
A. All dedicated parking spaces indicated shaded.PDC.November 2024
B. Parking schedule added.PDC.April 2025
C. Suggested waste collection areas added, subject to tracking.PDC.April 2025

Blue Pit Mill Queensway
Castleton Rochdale OL11 2PG

+44 (0)1706 631347

info@cjpartnership.com

www.cjpartnership.com



Appendix B

Updated Landscape Plan

Appendix C

Transport Note 2

Proposed Extension to Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe

784-B039064

Transport Note 2

Issue 2

April 2025

Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd



TETRA TECH

Document Control

Document:	Transport Note 2
Project:	Proposed Extension to Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe
Client:	Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd
Project Number:	784-B039064
File Origin:	\\lds-dc-vm-101\data\Projects\784-B039064 Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe\60 Project Output\61 Work In Progress\Draft Documents\TN 02

Revision:	Issue 1	Prepared by:	A Khan
Date:	17/04/2025	Checked by:	M Thompson
Status:	For Information	Approved By:	A Khan

Revision:	Issue 2	Prepared by:	A Khan
Date:	22/04/2025	Checked by:	M Thompson
Status:	For Information	Approved By:	A Khan

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Responses to LHA Comments on Parking.....	5
3.0	Response to LHA Comments on Site Layout Tracking.....	9
4.0	Responses to TfGM Comments	10
5.0	Summary and Conclusions.....	12

Plan

Plan 1: Site Location and Local Highway Network

Appendices

- Appendix 1: LHA and GMFRS comments (contained within LPA email)
- Appendix 2: TfGM comments
- Appendix 3: Proposed Site Layout
- Appendix 4: Tracking with Box Van
- Appendix 5: Tracking with Refuse Vehicle
- Appendix 6: Tracking with Fire Appliance

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Tetra Tech (TT) has been commissioned by Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd to provide transport and highways advice in relation to an extension to the existing Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, Bury Council Planning Application Ref: 71000.
- 1.1.2 The location of the site relative to the local highway network is shown on **Plan 1**.
- 1.1.3 The proposal is for 17 small starter industrial units with a combined total gross floor area of 553 sqm with 19 car parking spaces to be provided adjacent the proposed units.
- 1.1.4 The proposed units will be located within the expanded Eton Business Park. Access to the new units will be via the existing business park site access off Eton Hill Road.
- 1.1.5 The planning application was submitted in July 2024 and included in the submission package was Transport Note 1 (TN1) which was prepared by TT in May 2024.
- 1.1.6 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) have collated the consultation comments which they received and provided those to the applicant via email (dated 20th February 2025 – see **Appendix 1**). Within the LPA email, the comments which relate to transport/highways are from the Local Highway Authority (LHA) at Bury Council (BC) and the Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (GMFRS).
- 1.1.7 Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) has also provided comments on the proposals (dated 18th October 2024), which are contained in **Appendix 2**.
- 1.1.8 The purpose of this Transport Note 2 (TN2) is to address the highways and transport related comments provided by the LHA, GMFRS and TfGM.

Revised Site Layout

- 1.1.9 The revised site layout is contained in **Appendix 3**. This shows:
- 17 Industrial Units (B2 / B8 land uses) with a combined floorspace of 553 sqm.
 - 19 car parking spaces (including 2 blue badge spaces) dedicated to the start-up units. Whilst these are dedicated to the start-ups, they are communal across the start-ups. i.e., not 1 space per unit.
 - 7 existing formal parking spaces, associated with the wider industrial estate, which are to be removed to facilitate the proposals.
 - 6 car parking spaces for the wider industrial estate, to replace the existing spaces to be removed.
 - 2 cycle parking spaces.
 - 2 motorcycle parking spaces.

2.0 Responses to LHA Comments on Parking

2.1.1 The This section addresses the LHA comments on parking (see **Appendix 1**).

Accessibility of the Site by Sustainable Travel Modes

2.1.2 When considering car parking provision for a development it is also pertinent to consider the accessibility of the development by sustainable travel modes.

2.1.3 It is noted that both the LHA and TfGM have not raised any issues with the accessibility of the site. This is not surprising given that the site is located in an establish built-up area with good accessibility by sustainable travel modes. The accessibility of the site is summarised as follows:

1. It is generally accepted that walking is the most important mode of travel at a local level and offers the greatest potential to reduce short car trips, particularly those under 2km.
2. Within 1km and 2km catchments from the centre of the site a large number of residential areas can be accessed on foot.
3. It is generally accepted that cycling has the potential to replace short car journeys, particularly those under 5km. Within this context the site is well located to encourage trips by bike with numerous residential areas located within a 5km cycle.
4. In terms of public transport provision, the nearest bus stops to the site are located on Bury Road within a few minutes' walk of the development, as they are less than 400m from the centre of the site. These stops provide hourly services to Bury Interchange and Farnworth Bus Station.
5. Radcliffe tram stop is located around a 6-minute cycle journey from the site and provides services along the green and yellow lines.

2.1.4 It is evident that access by public transport is a viable option to future users of the site.

2.1.5 Given the above, site will be accessible by sustainable modes in line with both national local policy on transport.

2.1.6 As the site has good a level of accessibility by sustainable travel modes, the level of car parking provision for the proposed development should not be set at a high level, to encourage travel by active travel modes and by public transport.

Adopted Bury Parking Standards and Proposed Parking Provision

2.1.7 The adopted level of parking provision for the development is set out within the Council' adopted parking standards, which are contained in their SPD 11.

2.1.8 The LHA indicates (see **Appendix 1**) that: '*SPD 11: Parking advises under at least 16 parking spaces should be provided for a development of this size, under 5b*).' This is incorrect as in applying the 'under 5b' parking standards the LHA have used the parking standard for B1 land use which is for offices. The proposal is for B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage/distribution) land uses.

2.1.9 Given the above, the LHA statement that the submitted Transport Note has determined the car parking level incorrectly is plainly wrong.

2.1.10 The site should be considered against the proposed land uses (B2 & B8). In terms of the Bury Parking Standard, the B2 land use requires more parking spaces per sqm of floorspace than the B8

land use. For robustness the following parking assessment has been carried out based on the B2 land use, however given that some of the site will be B8, the actual parking requirement should be lower.

- 2.1.11 Furthermore, it should be noted that the Bury Council parking standards for industrial land uses are maximum standards. Generally, this means that developers should not exceed the full maximum standards, subject to other considerations.
- 2.1.12 The Bury Councils B2 parking standards are re-produced in **Table 2.1** and an assessment of the proposed 17 units, which have a combined floorspace of 553 sqm is provided in **Table 2.2** (see **Appendix 3** for the revised site layout), together with further 2 spaces for disabled users.
- 2.1.13 It should be noted that the parking provision on-site will be communal, rather than designated to individual occupiers and given this, the parking standard assessment is carried out on the combined GFA of all 17 units (553 sqm).

Table 2.1: SPD11 - Bury Council Parking Standards for B2 Land Use

a) Type of Development	b) MAXIMUM Standards for car parking provision (excluding disabled parking)	c) MINIMUM Standards for car parking provision for those who are disabled	d) MINIMUM standards for cycle parking provision	e) MINIMUM standards for TWMVs parking	f) Additional Considerations
6. General Industry (B2)	1 per 60 sqm	Up to and including 200 bays – individual bays for each disabled employee plus 2 bays or 5% total capacity, <i>which ever is greater.</i> Over 200 bays – 6 bays <i>plus</i> 2% of total capacity	1 per 700 sqm – minimum of 2 spaces <i>Note:</i> 10% of cycle spaces should be allocated for customers (short-stay) and 90% for staff (long-stay).	1 per 2,800 sqm – minimum of 2 spaces	

Table 2.2: Parking Assessment Based on Parking Standards in SPD11

Use For	SPD11 Parking Standards	SPD11 Required Provision	Proposed Provision	Over Provision
Cars - Standard Spaces	1/60 sqm (maximum standards)	10	17	7
Cars - Disable Spaces	2 bays or 5% of total capacity, whichever is greater (minimum standards)	2	2	0
Cyclists	1/700sqm, min of 2, whichever is greatest (minimum standards)	2	2	0
Two-wheel motorised vehicles	1/2,800 sqm min of 2, whichever greatest (minimum standards)	2	2	0

- 2.1.14 **Table 2.2** demonstrates that the Bury Council parking standards require 10 car parking and 2 blue badge spaces for 553 sqm of B2 land uses and the proposals provide 17 car parking and 2 blue badge spaces (i.e, total 19 spaces). The proposals therefore more than accord with the parking standards. The 17 car parking spaces represents 70% more parking than the 10 spaces required under the parking standards.

- 2.1.15 The proposals also accord with the parking standards in relation to cyclists and two-wheel motorised users.
- 2.1.16 A further comment in relation to parking has been provided by the LHA in relation to their site visit. The comment indicates that:
- ‘.....having visited the application site and driven through and around Eton Hill Business Park, most units had two cars parked in front of them. No justification has been provided for not providing two parking spaces outside each of the units when it is clear from the rest of the business park that car parking is predominant on this business park.’*
- 2.1.17 The justification for not providing 2 spaces per unit is clear. The parking standards do not require 2 spaces per unit. The basis of deriving the car parking provision for the proposals is the formally adopted Bury parking standards and not what other existing units on the wider site have provided, which may have different floor areas than the proposals. Additionally, their parking provision may have been based on previous parking standards that were applicable at the time planning permission was granted. It is worth noting also that the applicant is confident that given the very small floor areas for these proposed new units, that 1 space per unit is all that is required when the potential occupiers’ considerations are taken into account.
- 2.1.18 The LHA also indicate that:
- ‘TfGM suggest 12 new spaces is not enough but divert to the LHA. The submitted Transport Note states 12 spaces are to be provided.’*
- 2.1.19 Contrary to the above LHA statement, TfGM do not indicate that the 12 spaces are not enough. They simply state that: *‘In terms of car parking provision, 12 car parking spaces are proposed to serve the site.’* see **Appendix 2**. This comment was based on the proposed site plan at the time of the TfGM consultation, which did show 12 spaces. The revised site plan now shows 19 spaces. Nonetheless, TfGM did not provide the above comment suggested by the LHA towards the 12 spaces proposed on the original scheme within their consultation response.
- 2.1.20 The LHA response indicates that notwithstanding the SPD requirements, having seen the car parking demand on the wider site, the LPA considers that each unit should be provided with at least one vehicle parking space per unit and separate parking provision for visitors and vans making deliveries to the proposed units.
- 2.1.21 As can be seen from **Table 2.2** and **Appendix C**, the revised site layout provides the requested 17 standard car parking spaces, for the 17 units, albeit they are unallocated. The revised proposals therefore accord with the LHA comments. This provision is 70% higher than the Council’s maximum car parking standards.
- 2.1.22 The fact that the spaces are unallocated across the 17 units, will allow for visitor parking.
- 2.1.23 As previously set out, the proposal is for a mixture of B2 and B8 uses. The parking requirement for B8 land use is much lower than the B2 land use which has been used for an assessment of the parking standards for robustness.
- 2.1.24 Given that the proposed number of car parking spaces is well in excess of the maximum standards, there is no justification to provide further spaces for visitors and delivery vehicles. The Council’s

parking standards do not require separate parking provision for visitors and delivery vehicles. In any case the proposed parking provision will cater for potential visitors and delivery vehicles.

2.1.25 In conclusion, given this evidence in this section:

- the proposals provide parking in excess of the Adopted Parking Standards.
- the proposed parking provision will be more than adequate for the proposed development.
- the proposals will not impact existing businesses within the wider Eton Business Park.

3.0 Response to LHA Comments on Site Layout Tracking

- 3.1.1 This section addresses the LHA comments relating to tracking for the proposed site layout.
- 3.1.2 The proposed site layout contained in **Appendix 3**. The site layout has changed due to the provision of additional parking spaces.
- 3.1.3 Given the comments from the LHA and revised site layout, tracking has been carried out with:
- A large box van
 - A refuse vehicle
 - A fire appliance.

Large Box Van Tracking

- 3.1.4 The applicant has confirmed that the largest vehicle that will be used for the 17 units will be a large box van (8.01m long).
- 3.1.5 **Appendix 4** shows tracking with a large box van, as can be seen from the tracking the box van can access all the proposed units satisfactorily.

Refuse Vehicle Tracking

- 3.1.6 The applicant has confirmed that the largest refuse vehicle that will serve the units will be 8.9m long.
- 3.1.7 **Appendix 5** shows tracking with this refuse vehicle, as can be seen from the tracking the refuse can access the proposed waste collection areas satisfactorily.

Fire Appliance Tracking

- 3.1.8 The typical standard size of fire engine used by Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (GMFRS) is 7.9m pumping appliance, which is less onerous than the 8.9m long refuse vehicle, see above.
- 3.1.9 **Appendix 6** shows tracking with this fire appliance, as can be seen from the tracking the vehicle can easily access the proposed units.
- 3.1.10 A water hydrant will be provided close to the site, if necessary.

4.0 Responses to TfGM Comments

- 4.1.1 This section addresses the TfGM comments, which are contained in **Appendix 2**.
- 4.1.2 TfGM is not a statutory consultee. They have made some recommendations to the LPA.

Traffic Regulation Orders

- 4.1.3 TfGM State: *'TfGM would suggest that a review of the Traffic Regulation Orders in the vicinity of the development is undertaken. This should cover the potential for introducing additional parking restrictions, as well as ensuring adequate parking restrictions remain in place, and are refreshed accordingly. This will help to discourage pavement parking associated with the development and therefore assist in improving the quality of the surrounding public realm.'*
- 4.1.4 As demonstrated in section 2, the proposed car parking provision is 70% higher than the Council's maximum parking standards. Given this there will not be any pavement parking associated with the proposed development.
- 4.1.5 Given the above, there is no justification for a review of the Traffic Regulation Orders.

Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

- 4.1.6 TfGM State: *'A robust Construction Traffic Management Plan should be employed as part of the development.'*
- 4.1.7 The requirement for a CTMP, if necessary, can be conditioned.

Active Travel

- 4.1.8 TfGM suggest improvements to pedestrian environment to help encourage the uptake of active travel modes by future employees, as follows:
- *'Any redundant vehicle access points should be reinstated as continuous footway to adoptable standards.'*
 - *'The access point(s) serving the site should be designed to ensure the provision of tactile paving and dropped kerbs (if not already in place).'*
- 4.1.9 There will be no redundant vehicle access points that would require reinstatement.
- 4.1.10 The proposed development is situated within an established business park, which is already linked to good quality footway network on the adjacent adopted highway, which benefits from street lighting, natural surveillance from existing properties. This includes footways on Eton Hill Road and Bury Road.
- 4.1.11 The site access road at its junction with Eton Hill Road already benefits from dropped kerbs on both sides of the access road.

Cycle Parking

- 4.1.12 TfGM State: *'Cycle parking should be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards and where possible spaces in excess of the minimum provided.'*
- 4.1.13 Cycle parking will be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards, see **Table 2.2** in section 2 above. The location of the cycle parking is situated in an accessible and secure

location. The wider site benefits from lighting and CCTV provision. Additionally, new lighting will be provided for the proposed parking area that will serve the new units, as necessary.


Travel Plan

- 4.1.14 TfGM State: *'TfGM recommends that a either a Travel Plan / Travel Pack is produced for the development.'*
- 4.1.15 The requirements for preparing travel plans are set out in SPD12: *'Development Control Policy Guidance Note 12: Travel Plans in Bury.'*
- 4.1.16 The SPD12 states that travel plans should be submitted in conjunction with planning applications which are likely to have significant transport implications, essentially relating to major developments.
- 4.1.17 The proposed development is a minor development with a GFA of only 533 sqm and accordingly it will not have any significant transport implications.
- 4.1.18 Table 1 in SPD12 sets out thresholds for requiring a Travel Plan. For offices, light industry and research & development the threshold is greater than 2,500 sqm. No specific threshold is provided for B2/B8 land uses.
- 4.1.19 Given the above, there is no planning justifications for preparing a Travel Plan/Travel Pack for the proposed development.

5.0 Summary and Conclusions

- 5.1.1 Tetra Tech (TT) has been commissioned by Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd to provide transport and highways advice in relation to an extension to the existing Eton Business Park in Radcliffe.
- 5.1.2 The proposal is for 17 small starter industrial units with a total gross floor area of 553 sqm with 19 car parking spaces (including 2 blue badge spaces). Access to the new units will be through the existing Eton Business Park, via the access which serves the business park off Eton Hill Road.
- 5.1.3 TT prepared a Transport Note 1 (TN1) in May 2024 which was submitted with the planning application. Following the submission of the planning application (Ref: 71000) the LHA at Bury Council and GMFRS have provided highways/transport related comments on the proposals.
- 5.1.4 Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) has also provided comments on the proposals.
- 5.1.5 This TN2 has addressed the highways/transport related comments on the proposals by the LHA and TfGM.
- 5.1.6 In addressing the LHA comments this TN2 demonstrates that:
- a) Based on the revised site layout, the proposed car parking provision is in excess of the adopted Bury car parking maximum standards.
 - b) The proposed parking for cyclists, disabled drivers and two-wheel motorised vehicles is in accordance with Bury parking minimum standards.
 - c) The proposals will not impact existing businesses within the wider Eton Business Park.
 - d) Tracking has confirmed that the largest heavy goods vehicle that is likely to serve the industrial units can be accommodated.
 - e) Tracking has confirmed that with the largest refuse vehicle that is likely to serve the industrial units can be accommodated.
 - f) Tracking has confirmed that the typical pumping appliance used by Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service can satisfactorily access the proposed industrial units.
- 5.1.7 The TfGM comments have also been addressed in this TN2.
- 5.1.8 Key conclusions:
- Car parking provision is adequate and is in line with the maximum parking standards.
 - Parking provision for cyclists, disabled drivers and two-wheel motorised vehicles accords with the Bury minimum parking standards.
 - Tracking has confirmed that the largest vehicles that are likely to access the development site, i.e HGV, refuse vehicle and fire appliance can access the site safely and satisfactorily.
 - Safe and suitable access is provided for all users.
 - Given the very small size of the development a Travel Plan is not justified.
- 5.1.9 Given the above, there are no highways or transport reasons why the planning application should not be approved.

Plan



© Tetra Tech Limited  TETRA TECH	Plan 1: Site Location & Local Highway Network Proposal: Industrial Units Location: Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe TT Job No.: 784-B039064	 Legend  Approx Site Location  Nearest Bus Stops
0 125 250 375 500 Meters Scale: 1:10,000 @A4		16 April 2025 NGR: 379,371 E / 408,409 N © Crown Copyright All rights reserved. Licence number: 100019980

Appendices

Appendix 1: LHA and GMFRS comments (contained within LPA email)

Subject: FW: PA 71000: - Eton Hill Business Park, Bury - LPA's position and agreement to decision timeframe required

Importance: High

From: Booth, Claire <Claire.Booth@bury.gov.uk>

Sent: 20 February 2025 15:23

To: 'Paul Clark' <paul.c@cpartnership.com>

Subject: PA 71000: - Eton Hill Business Park, Bury - LPA's position and agreement to decision timeframe required

Importance: High

Good afternoon, Paul,

I have collated the issues outstanding on the above-mentioned proposals. Please find them below for you to address:

Biodiversity Net Gain

The BNG report and metric demonstrate that the proposals will result in a net loss of biodiversity with the trading rules of the metric being broken. No information has been provided on how these losses will be addressed. The applicants have therefore not demonstrated that the general condition on BNG, which is attached to all relevant planning permissions, can be discharged and further information is required.

In addition, the metric claims that the line of trees on the site will be enhanced to become a species rich hedgerow with trees. However, the only hedge species to be planted on the landscaping plan is beech and would not therefore be a species rich hedge, besides not being native to Bury.

Other Biodiversity issues

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies one tree that has moderate bat roosting potential and that if it is affected by the proposals further surveys would be required. It is not clear if this tree is impacted by the proposal. Clarification is therefore required and if the tree is impacted, the surveys should be undertaken **prior to the determination of the application.**

Notwithstanding the above issues, the Appraisal makes precautionary recommendations to protect species during any construction works. These include nesting birds, amphibians, bats and hedgehogs. The Council's Ecology advisors advise that these measures be included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity and the following condition be attached to any permission, should it be granted:

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.*
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".*
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).*
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.*
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.*
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.*
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.*
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.*

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

A management plan for the proposed treatment of Japanese knotweed has been submitted with the application. Its implementation could be secured by condition.

The Appraisal also make recommendation for enhancement measures for species, which are not included with biodiversity net gain. As the recommended bird boxes do not appear to have been included in the landscaping plan, the Council's Ecologists advise that the following condition, or similar, be attached to any permission:

A scheme for the bird boxes, as set out in section 5.2 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report by Elton Ecology dated 14 July 2024 (ref: P2582_01), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development (or in accordance with a phasing plan which shall first be agreed in writing with the local planning authority) and shall be retained thereafter.

As you are having to provide additional information and clarity you could avoid the avoid the above-mentioned planning condition by providing the required details at this stage.

All of the above matters will need to be satisfactorily addressed if the LPA is to support this proposal.

Parking and Highway Safety matters

The Council considers the site to be over-developed and highly constrained:

- Loss of car parking provision to accommodate the development – there is no justification within the submission discussing the impact of losing car parking spaces would impact on businesses within the wider business park. Also, having visited the application site and driven through and around Eton Hill Business Park, most units had two cars parked in front of them. No justification has been provided for not providing two parking spaces outside each of the units when it is clear from the rest of the business park that car parking is predominant on this business park. Notably, the submitted Transport Note has determined the level of car parking provision incorrectly.
- Car Parking Provision is insufficient. TfGM suggest 12 new spaces is not enough but divert to the LHA. The submitted Transport Note states 12 spaces are to be provided.

SPD 11: Parking advises under at least 16 parking spaces should be provided for a development of this size, under 5b). In addition, 2 disabled car parking spaces are required, at least 2 spaces for Two-wheel motorised vehicles – your client will know if the specific existing site use suggests more. The provision for Two Wheel motorised vehicle parking provision is required to be covered and secure.

Notwithstanding the SPD requirements, having seen the car parking demand on the wider site, the LPA considers each unit should be provided with at least one vehicle parking space per unit, preferably two spaces, along with providing separate car parking provision for visitors and delivery vehicles.

- The Council points you to the provide two car parking spaces per unit and separate parking provision for visitors and vans making deliveries to the proposed units.
- Access for the Fire Service is not achievable – see their response online and section below.
- Lack of Waste Management details and no refuse collection area. Refuse collection wagons are all larger than the large van tracking which has been undertaken. Please provide both tracking details for the refuse collection vehicle, a Waste Management Statement and the plans will need to be amended to provide a sufficiently sized refuse collection area.

- The LPA notes that the Proposed Site Plan does not have a key, therefore it is unclear how many car parking spaces are actually proposed. It seems to me that the Transport Note may not correspond with the submitted Proposed Site Plan.
- Please also address all of the comments and recommendations made by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

Please note, the above is a summary of the comments received so far from the Local Highway Authority. They have not yet made their final recommendations and therefore the above matters may be subject to change.

Fire Safety

Please see the response from Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue attached. As it stands the site and its lack of access for a fire engine would render the site unsafe for future occupants. The application cannot be supported on this basis.

As a minimum vehicular tracking needs to be provided to demonstrate the fire service can enter and leave the site in a fire engine and access all proposed units, and a water hydrant needs to be provided close to the site.

Design and Layout

For all the above reasons, the Council considers the site as submitted to be over-developed, highly constrained, and unsafe, contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and UDP policies EN1/2 which seek well-designed and accessible places.

Drainage/ United Utilities (UU's)

Please find attached UU's recommendations. Whilst they have advised a condition, it would be prudent to furnish UU/ the LPA with the drainage plan United Utilities has requested. It will be in your client's interest to provide this as part of this application, as he needs to be sure that their requirements are met given the site wants to drain to their infrastructure.

Moving Forward

Once again, I apologise for the length of time taken to provide this breakdown of issues. I hope however, all of the above now lets you and your clients consider how to move forward in bringing this application to a conclusion.

The Council ask you to agree to extend the decision timescale on this application to cover addressing the issues outlined above, any necessary re-consultation required with consultees and neighbours, and/ or the timeframe needed to cover the decision-making timeframe, including the time needed for you to assess any necessary pre-commencement conditions, if the LPA is minded to approve the application.

Please confirm within the next 5 working days that your client agrees to extend the decision timeframe to cover all of the above.

Once we have agreement, and you determine how long it will take to provide all the requested amendments and additional information, we can firm up timescales.

As always, your client has the right to withdraw the application, and I suggest this route is taken if a significant re-design of the proposed development is required.

I trust all the above is self-explanatory, but please call me if you wish to discuss.

Kind regards,

Claire Booth
Senior Planning Officer
Development Management
3 Knowsley Place, Duke Street, Bury, BL9 0EJ
Phone: 0161 253 5396
Email: Claire.Booth@bury.gov.uk

Under the General Data Protection Regulation as supplemented by the UK Data Protection Act 2018, by providing your personal information you are giving your consent for us to use and collate your personal data to enable us to perform the contract we have entered into with you to process your planning application, enquiry or representation and comply with our legal obligation to carry out a public task/function and provide a planning service.

To find out how we process your personal information please read our Privacy Notice at <https://www.bury.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=14263>

Appendix 2: TfGM comments

Your ref: 71000
Our ref: BUR/24/350

Bury Council
Planning Services
3 Knowsley Place
Duke Street
Bury
BL9 0EJ

18th October 2024

Location: **Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Rochdale**

Development: **Erection of 17 no. small light industrial units with associated servicing and car parking**

Dear Claire Booth

Thank you for consulting Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) on the above planning application. The following comments are offered as advice on transport issues for you to balance against other factors and are made in the context of TfGM's role in the planning process, as set out in the footnote below.

Background

The application seeks approval for an extension to the existing Eton Business Park, to provide 17 industrial units with a total floor area of 608sqm. The site will be accessed from Eton Hill Road.

Highways Overview

Colleagues from within TfGM HFAS (Highways Forecasting Analytical Services) and TfGM UTC (Urban Traffic Control) have reviewed the Transport Note (TN) issued in

¹TfGM does not have any planning powers and is not a statutory consultee in the planning process. The purpose of the advice offered is to suggest the best way to improve land use / transport integration through the development proposals. Advice is based on the information provided by the applicant, and it is not TfGM's role to undertake detailed verification unless specifically commissioned to do so. ²TfGM control and manage the traffic signals in Greater Manchester, as such any schemes that alter signalised junctions need to be agreed with TfGM. Additionally, where developments impact on signalised junctions, TfGM have a duty of care to ensure that these impacts are satisfactorily mitigated as part of the planning process.



support of the proposed industrial development and have provided comments in respect of the relevant sections.

I. Trip Generation

The quantum of development falls below TfGM's requirement for a highway impact assessment.

II. Proposed Internal Access Arrangements

The TN confirms that the site will be served via the existing access arrangements for the business park, from Eton Hill Road.

In terms of car parking provision, 12 car parking spaces are proposed to serve the site.

Swept path plans are contained within the TN appendices for a large box van to demonstrate that the largest intended service vehicle can enter and exit the site in forward gear, carrying out turning manoeuvres within the car park.

TfGM would refer to the Local Highway Authority (LHA) to determine whether the proposed access, car parking and servicing arrangements are acceptable.

III. Traffic Regulation Orders

TfGM would suggest that a review of the Traffic Regulation Orders in the vicinity of the development is undertaken. This should cover the potential for introducing additional parking restrictions, as well as ensuring adequate parking restrictions remain in place, and are refreshed accordingly. This will help to discourage pavement parking associated with the development and therefore assist in improving the quality of the surrounding public realm.

IV. Other

A robust Construction Traffic Management Plan should be employed as part of the development.



Every journey. Every day.

Site Accessibility

I. Public Transport

The nearest bus stops to the site are located on Bury Road within a few minutes' walk of the development. These stops provide hourly services to Bury Interchange and Farnworth Bus Station.

Radcliffe tram stop is located around a 6-minute cycle journey from the site and provides services along the green and yellow lines.

It is considered that there are some public transport options available to future users of the site.

II. Active Travel

In order to encourage walking and cycling, it should be ensured that the pedestrian and cycling environment, within and around the site, is designed to be as safe, attractive and convenient as possible, including natural surveillance where possible. This should provide sufficient links to the surrounding pedestrian and cycle networks.

To establish travel patterns at the beginning of occupation and encourage modal shift to sustainable modes of travel, it is important to ensure the facilities are in place to support sustainability. Therefore, improvements to the pedestrian environment are required to help encourage the uptake of active travel modes by future employees, as follows:

Recommendations:

- Any redundant vehicle access points should be reinstated as continuous footway to adoptable standards.
- The access point(s) serving the site should be designed to ensure the provision of tactile paving and dropped kerbs (if not already in place).

III. Cycle Parking

The TN does not refer to staff cycle parking provision for the industrial development. Cycle parking should be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards and where possible spaces in excess of the minimum provided.



Every journey. Every day.

The cycle store should be suitable for long-stay cycle parking, which is lockable and covered, located in a central accessible location, with sufficient lighting and CCTV.

IV. Travel Plan

There is no reference to a Travel Plan / Travel Pack for the development.

TfGM recommends that a either a Travel Plan / Travel Pack is produced for the development, with the objective of reducing reliance on the private car, particularly single occupancy use. The Travel Plan should be designed to raise awareness of opportunities for reducing travel by car and should feature a range of measures and initiatives promoting a choice of transport mode, and a clear monitoring regime with agreed targets.

In order to encourage sustainable journeys to mitigate the traffic impact of the development, through the Travel Plan, incentives should be offered to encourage future occupiers to use public transport and active travel modes through measures such as concessionary bus fares, discounted cycles, journey planning etc.

I hope you find these comments useful in the determination of this planning application. Should you wish to discuss any matter further please do not hesitate to contact the Landuse team via the details below.


Yours faithfully

Landuse Team
Highways Department
Transport for Greater Manchester
Email: landuse@tfgm.com




Every journey. Every day.

Appendix 3: Proposed Site Layout



Parking Schedule for development of 5,950 sq ft B2 use

- 1.New dedicated parking spaces for units(17No total)
- 2.New disabled parking spaces (2No in total)
- 3.Spaces lost to make way for the new development (7No in total)
- 4.Replacement spaces for those lost (6No in total)
- 5.2no cycle spaces
- 6.2No TWMV spaces
- 7.Suggesed waste collection areas



Hamilton Heath Estates
Eton Business Park
Radcliffe
Eton Hill Road
Bury

Site Plan as Proposed SK01

work to figured dimensions

© CJ Partnership owns the copyright of this design / drawing which must not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of CJ Partnership

contract no
3672

drawn by

drawing no
02

date
January 2024

revision
C

scale @ A3
1:1000

planning

Revisions:
A. All dedicated parking spaces indicated shaded.PDC.November 2024
B. Parking schedule added.PDC.April 2025
C. Suggested waste collection areas added, subject to tracking.PDC.April 2025

Blue Pit Mill Queensway
Castleton Rochdale OL11 2PG


+44 (0)1706 631347

info@cjpartnership.com

www.cjpartnership.com




Appendix 4: Tracking with Box Van




Entering - Large Van:

- Notes:
- This drawing should be read in relation to the subject of the title only. Other information shown on the drawing is to be considered indicative only. Reference should be made to appropriate drawing series/specifications for other information.
 - All dimensions are in metres unless specified otherwise.
 - This drawing is based on Site Layout drawing 3672-02 Rev C provided by CJ Partnership. Tetra Tech does not take responsibility for any discrepancies.

Large Van Vehicle Profile:



7.5t Box Van	8.010m
Overall Length	2.100m
Overall Width	3.556m
Overall Body Height	0.351m
Min Body Ground Clearance	2.064m
Track Width	4.00s
Lock to lock time	7.400m
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	
Wheel Track	
Body Track	



Exiting - Large Van:

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

P02	Updated site layout	15.04.2025	AB	AK	AK
P01	Preliminary first issue	02.04.2024	AB	AK	AK
Rev	Description	Date	By	CHK	App

Issuing Office

Tetra Tech Manchester
11 York Street,
Manchester, M2 2AW
Tel: +44 (0)161 872 3223
www.tetrattechurope.com




Client
Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd

Project Name
**Proposed New Industrial Units: Eton
Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe**

Sheet Title
**Proposed Site Layout: Swept Path Analysis
- Large Van**

TTE Project Number	Drawn By	Date	Checked By	Date	Approved By	Date	Scale @	Suitability
784-B039064	AB	Mar '24	AK	Mar '24	AK	Mar '24	As Shown	S0
Client Project Number	Originator	Volume/System	Level/Location	Type/Code	Role	Number	Revision	
B039064	- TTE	- 00	- XX	- TR	- D	- 004-01	P02	



- Notes:
1. This drawing should be read in relation to the subject of the title only. Other information shown on the drawing is to be considered indicative only. Reference should be made to appropriate drawing series/specifications for other information.
 2. All dimensions are in metres unless specified otherwise.
 3. This drawing is based on Site Layout drawing 3672-02 Rev C provided by CJ Partnership. Tetra Tech does not take responsibility for any discrepancies.

Large Van Vehicle Profile:

8.01	
2.1	4.25
1.21	
7.5t Box Van	
Overall Length	8.010m
Overall Width	2.100m
Overall Body Height	3.556m
Min Body ground Clearance	0.351m
Track Width	2.064m
Lock to lock time	4.00s
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	7.400m
Wheel Track	
Body Track	

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

P02	Updated site layout	15.04.2025	AB	AK	AK
P01	Preliminary first issue	02.04.2024	AB	AK	AK
Rev	Description	Date	By	CHK	App

Issuing Office
Tetra Tech Manchester
11 York Street,
Manchester, M2 2AW
Tel: +44 (0)161 872 3223
www.tetrattechurope.com




Client
Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd

Project Name
**Proposed New Industrial Units: Eton
Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe**

Sheet Title
**Proposed Site Layout: Swept Path
Analysis - Large Van Accessing
Proposed Units:**

TTE Project Number	Drawn By	Date	Checked By	Date	Approved By	Date	Scale @	Subsity
784-B039064	AB	Mar '24	AK	Mar '24	AK	Mar '24	As Shown	S0
Client Project Number	Originator	Volume/System Level/Location	Type/Code	Role	Number	Revision		
B039064	- TTE	- 00 - XX	- TR - D	- 004-02	P02			

Appendix 5: Tracking with Refuse Vehicle




Eton Hill Road

Proposed waste collection areas

Notes:

1. This drawing should be read in relation to the subject of the title only. Other information shown on the drawing is to be considered indicative only. Reference should be made to appropriate drawing series/specifications for other information.
2. All dimensions are in metres unless specified otherwise.
3. This drawing is based on Site Layout drawing 3672-02 Rev C provided by CJ Partnership. Tetra Tech does not take responsibility for any discrepancies.

Refuse Vehicle Profile:



Phoenix 2-15W (with Elite 2 6x2ML chassis)

Overall Length	8.970m
Overall Width	2.530m
Overall Body Height	3.211m
Min Body Ground Clearance	0.416m
Track Width	2.530m
Lock to lock time	4.00s
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	7.550m
Wheel Track	
Body Track	

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

P01	Preliminary first issue	15.04.2025	AB	AK	AK
Rev	Description	Date	Rev	CHK	App

Issuing Office
Tetra Tech Manchester
11 York Street,
Manchester, M2 2AW
Tel: +44 (0)161 872 3223
www.tetrateteurope.com




Client
Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd

Project Name
Proposed New Industrial Units: Eton
Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe

Sheet Title
Proposed Site Layout: Swept Path
Analysis - Refuse Vehicle Entering the Site

TTE Project Number	Drawn By	Date	Checked By	Date	Approved By	Date	Scale @	Suitability
784-B039064	AB	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	As Shown	S0
Client Project Number	Originator	Volume/System Level/Location	Type/Code	Role	Number	Revision		
B039064	- TTE	- 00	- XX	- TR	- D	- 006-01	P02	




Eton Hill Road

Proposed waste collection areas

Notes:

1. This drawing should be read in relation to the subject of the title only. Other information shown on the drawing is to be considered indicative only. Reference should be made to appropriate drawing series/specifications for other information.
2. All dimensions are in metres unless specified otherwise.
3. This drawing is based on Site Layout drawing 3672-02 Rev C provided by CJ Partnership. Tetra Tech does not take responsibility for any discrepancies.

Refuse Vehicle Profile:



Phoenix 2-15W (with Elite 2 6x2ML chassis)

Overall Length	8.970m
Overall Width	2.530m
Overall Body Height	3.211m
Min Body Ground Clearance	0.416m
Track Width	2.530m
Lock to lock time	4.00s
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	7.550m
Wheel Track	
Body Track	

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

P01	Preliminary first issue	15.04.2025	AB	AK	AK
Rev	Description	Date	Rev	CHK	App

Issuing Office

Tetra Tech Manchester
11 York Street,
Manchester, M2 2AW
Tel: +44 (0)161 872 3223
www.tetrateteurope.com



Client

Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd

Project Name

Proposed New Industrial Units: Eton
Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe


Sheet Title

Proposed Site Layout: Swept Path
Analysis - Refuse Vehicle Exiting the Site

TTE Project Number	Drawn By	Date	Checked By	Date	Approved By	Date	Scale @	Subsidiary
784-B039064	AB	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	As Shown	S0


Client Project Number	Originator	Volume/System Level/Location	Type/Code	Role	Number	Revision
B039064	- TTE	- 00	- XX	- TR	- D	- 006-02 P02

Appendix 6: Tracking with Fire Appliance



- Notes:
1. This drawing should be read in relation to the subject of the title only. Other information shown on the drawing is to be considered indicative only. Reference should be made to appropriate drawing series/specifications for other information.
 2. All dimensions are in metres unless specified otherwise.
 3. This drawing is based on Site Layout drawing 3672-02 Rev C provided by CJ Partnership. Tetra Tech does not take responsibility for any discrepancies.

Fire Appliance Vehicle Profile:



Pumping Appliance	7.900m
Overall Length	2.500m
Overall Width	3.300m
Overall Body Height	0.140m
Min Body Ground Clearance	2.500m
Track Width	4.00s
Lock to lock time	7.750m
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	
Wheel Track	
Body Track	

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

P01	Preliminary first issue	15.04.2025	AB	AK	AK
Rev	Description	Date	By	CHK	App

Issuing Office

Tetra Tech Manchester

11 York Street,
Manchester, M2 2AW

Tel: +44 (0)161 872 3223
www.tetrattechurope.com

Client



Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd


Project Name

Proposed New Industrial Units: Eton
Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe

Sheet Title


Proposed Site Layout: Swept Path
Analysis - Fire Appliance Entering
the Site

TTE Project Number	Drawn By	Date	Checked By	Date	Approved By	Date	Scale @ A3	Suitability
784-B039064	AB	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	As Shown	S0
Client Project Number	Originator	Volume/System Level/Location	Type/Code	Role	Number	Revision		
B039064	- TTE	- 00	- XX	- TR	- D	- 005-01	P01	



- Notes:
1. This drawing should be read in relation to the subject of the title only. Other information shown on the drawing is to be considered indicative only. Reference should be made to appropriate drawing series/specifications for other information.
 2. All dimensions are in metres unless specified otherwise.
 3. This drawing is based on Site Layout drawing 3672-02 Rev C provided by CJ Partnership. Tetra Tech does not take responsibility for any discrepancies.

Fire Appliance Vehicle Profile:



Pumping Appliance	7.900m
Overall Length	2.500m
Overall Width	3.300m
Overall Body Height	0.140m
Min Body Ground Clearance	2.500m
Track Width	4.00s
Lock to lock time	7.750m
Kerb to kerb Turning Radius	
Wheel Track	
Body Track	

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

P01	Preliminary first issue	15.04.2025	AB	AK	AK
Rev	Description	Date	By	CHK	App

Issuing Office
Tetra Tech Manchester
11 York Street,
Manchester, M2 2AW
Tel: +44 (0)161 872 3223
www.tetrattechurope.com



Client
Hamilton Heath Estates Ltd

Project Name
**Proposed New Industrial Units: Eton
Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe**

Sheet Title
**Proposed Site Layout: Swept Path
Analysis - Fire Appliance Exiting the
Site**

TTE Project Number	Drawn By	Date	Checked By	Date	Approved By	Date	Scale @	Suitability
784-B039064	AB	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	AK	Apr '25	A3 As Shown	S0
Client Project Number	Originator	Volume/System Level/Location	Type/Code	Role	Number	Revision		
B039064	- TTE	- 00	- XX	- TR	- D	- 005-02	P01	