

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Claire Booth	Date of report: 20/07/2026	Ref: 73158/FUL
Registration: 26/05/2026	LDFC: 17/06/2026	Expiry Date: 21/07/2026
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIOT

Proposal: Single storey nursery extension

Location: Gorsefield County Primary School, Robertson Street, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 0DW

Description

This application relates to the single storey nursery building at Gorsefield County Primary School.

Planning permission is sought for a single storey flat roof extension on the rear elevation of the nursery. It would project from the rear elevation of the building by approximately 3.1m. It would extend across the rear elevation of the building (12m). It would have a flat roof approximately 3.4m high. The height of the extension would sit above the eaves height of the application building by approximately 780mm.

The extension would be constructed of new brickwork walls to match the existing walls.

Relevant Planning History

44415 - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION & CREATION OF NEW CLASSROOM - Approved with Conditions, 03/06/2005

47215 - SINGLE STOREY CLASSROOM EXTENSION - Approved with Conditions, 12/01/2007

48375 - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO INFANTS BUILDING ON NORTH EAST ELEVATION - Approved with Conditions, 12/10/2007

59915 - Single storey classroom extension and replacement of existing conservatory with single storey extension; Formation of new main entrance with covered canopy - Approve with Conditions, 13/05/2016

Publicity

28 nearby neighbours were consulted by letter on the 27/05/2026. 1 representations has been received raising the following concerns/objections:

- The School has already exceeded the capacity of the site to accommodate it.
- The current staffing levels exceed the size of the car park.
- At 3:30pm traffic currently queues along the length of Robertson Street onto Knowles Street.
- The volume of traffic is causing damage to the road bed and structure.
- Residents vehicles are becoming damaged due to the state of the road and trying to force their way through the parked up street.
- A residents private entry to the rear of their property is being used as a Public Right of Way for both pedestrians and vehicle traffic.

- All the double parking and the businesses of drop-off and pick up times prevents residents from leaving home and coming home during those times.
- Some of the vehicles associated with the School exceed the 20mph speed limit, putting the safety of all in danger.
- All of the above issues have become greater as the school has become an academy. Before which the Head would discuss issues with residents whereas the current Head is uninterested.
- The more the School expands the worse the traffic gets and the more it affects residents.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No objections, subject to a planning condition securing a satisfactory foul and surface drainage scheme.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objections, but notes a public sewer is in close proximity to the proposed extension and recommends a planning condition to ensure satisfactory drainage that would not adversely affect the maintenance of and operation of the public sewer.

The Coal Authority - No objections but note that the an off-site mine shaft 378407-004 is located adjacent to the eastern part of the site, with its potential zone of influence extending partly into the site.

Traffic Section - No comments or observations received.

Pre-start Conditions - Not applicable.

Development Plan and Policies

JP-P5	Education, Skills and Knowledge
CF2	Education Land and Buildings
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy

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 of Development

UDP Policy CF2 - Education Land and Buildings states that the council will, where appropriate, consider favourably proposals for the provision, improvement and dual use of educational facilities.

PfE Policy JP-P5: Education, Skills and Knowledge supports the creation of improved and new facilities for all ages.

Based on the above policies, the proposal is acceptable in principle.

Design and Visual Amenity

Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design seeks to protect the character and townscape of the boroughs towns.

Policy HT5/1 - Access for those with Special Needs seeks to ensure better design of buildings to provide access for those with special needs.

The majority of the extensions that have been undertaken on the school site, all have sloping roofs. The application building/ the nursery building has a flat roof extension projecting from its front extension. This is clearly seen as a subordinate add on, as the connection to the original building is set down under the eaves. The applicant was asked to reflect the connecting design present on the front extension as the flat roof proposal fails to represent subordinate development.

Due to the requirements of the current Building Regulations the height of the set down part

of the front extension would not comply. Therefore, the height proposed, which exceeds the height of the eaves on the existing building, whilst not being subordinate to the host building is acceptable in this particular case as the boundary to the school with the terraced dwellings on Robertson Street contains a mature row of trees which screens views of the school grounds from the rear of the terraced properties along Robertson Street. Therefore, in this case, the proposed would thus not be unduly prominent in the locality or seen from the public highway, and thus and would be in accordance with Policy EN1/2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would be located to the rear of no. 21 Robertson Street. This property has a small single storey rear extension.

There are no adopted aspect standards between residential and non-residential uses however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case. It requires 6.5 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed single storey blank wall.

The south facing gable of the existing nursery building gable is approximately 15m from the two storey part of the terraced houses on Robertson Street and 14m from the single storey extension present on the rear elevation of .

As the proposal is single storey development and is separated from the neighbouring properties on Robertson Street, the proposal would not cause undue harm in terms of overlooking/ loss of privacy or by loss of light.

In terms of noise, whilst the proposed extension would result in more early year children attending the nursery, the proposal is very limited in size and would accommodate up to 23 more early year pupils and 3 no. additional teachers/ support staff.

In this instance therefore it is considered that the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties will not be materially harmed by the any additional noise increase generated on the site and in close proximity of residents on Robertson Street. The proposal therefore would accord with UDP Policy EN7/2.

Parking and Highway Safety

The School site has a 30 space car park. No additional on-site car parking provision is proposed to facilitate the proposed limited extension and the proposed extension would not reduce the size of this current car park.

The proposal would generate additional nursery space for up to 23 children and 3 additional staff. This would take the number of nursery children to 59 and the number of nursery staff to 7 in total. It should be noted that the proposed extension is relatively small and therefore these numbers indicate that the existing nursery school is not being used at its capacity.

The proposed increase in numbers will increase over the next two to three years.

The Local Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal and there are no defensible highway safety or lack of car parking provision grounds on which to justify refusal of this proposal on these grounds.

In relation to construction of the proposed extension, the car park is large enough to accommodate contractors vehicles outside school term times. There is also a grass verge within the site where a construction storage container or site office could be put well clear of the highway.

Based on all of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with PfE Policy JP-C8.

Ground Conditions and Safety

the application site falls partly within the defined Development High Risk Area (DHRA).

The Coal Authority records indicate that the plotted position of off-site mine shaft 378407-004 is located adjacent to the eastern part of the site, with its potential zone of influence extending partly into the site. Whilst an untreated or inadequately treated mine entry and its resultant zone of influence pose a significant risk not only to surface stability but also public safety, this feature is located away from the proposed development.

Whilst the Coal Authority's general approach in cases where development is proposed within the DHRA is to recommend that the applicant obtains coal mining information for the application site and submits a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to support their planning application. However, they note that the proposed single storey extension lies outside of the DHRA i.e. falls within the Development Low Risk Area. The Coal Authority's Planning & Development Team therefore does not consider that a Coal Mining Risk Assessment is required to support the proposal in this particular case, and as a result the Coal Authority do not object to this planning application.

Carbon and Energy

Policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy of the PfE requires development proposals to demonstrate how energy demand has been minimised and how energy efficiency has been maximised through appropriate design, construction, and operational measures. Compliance with the 2022 Part L Building Regulations is also expected as a minimum standard for energy performance.

A fabric-first approach has been adopted to improve the thermal performance of the building envelope and reduce operational energy demand. The extension will incorporate high levels of insulation, with U values designed to meet the requirements of Approved Document L of the Building Regulations. The building fabric will also be designed to achieve low air permeability, with thermal bridging addressed where practicable to improve overall energy efficiency.

Overall, the development is considered to accord with PfE Policy JP-S2 and represents a proportionate and compliant approach to energy efficiency for a small-scale nursery extension.

Digital Connectivity

PfE Policy JP-C2 states that all new developments shall have full fibre to premises connections, unless technical infeasible and/or unviable. The extension to the existing nursery building is of a small scale and will operate as part of the wider existing site. As such, no changes are proposed to the existing telecommunications infrastructure as part of the development.

Drainage

A public sewer appears to be present somewhere along the boundary of the School with Robertson Street. Given the nursery building is built within 5.5 metres of the shared boundary of the site with the rear lane of Robertson Street, the public sewer is likely to be located outside the boundary of the school. United Utilities have been consulted on this proposal and raised no objection subject to a condition securing a sustainable drainage scheme. The Council's Drainage section has also raised no objections subject to a satisfactory foul and surface water drainage scheme being secured by condition. Such conditions are therefore recommended. To allow the school to obtain the funding for the proposed extension, the recommended conditions have been changed from being pre-commencement to being "No above-ground works shall occur until ...". Subject to the imposition of such a condition, the proposal would accord with the requirements of PfE Policy JP-S4: Flood Risk and the Water Environment.

Public Representation

To address the concerns raised by a nearby resident the school has advised that it remain open to correspondence from Neighbours and advise that have actively reminded staff and parents to attempt to reduce vehicle access by car share and foot traffic where possible. It is difficult to encourage people to not used vehicular access when dropping and collecting young children before and after work.

They also advise that the school will also remind parents of the speed limits around the school as a proactive measure.

The submitted letter from the School's CEO confirms the main school is unable to expand above its current level. This proposal is to increase the number of nursery places in accordance with Government requirements.

The concerns relating to the poor condition and safety of the highway is a matter for the Local Highway Authority (Bury MBC) and not the school as it is beyond their control. Any correspondence therefore relating to its suitability and condition needs to be referred to the highways department. However, the Council's Highways team have raised no objections to this application.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to visual amenity or highway safety and therefore the proposal is recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 This permission relates to the following plans:

Drawing no. CA 01 Rev. B: Location Plan;
Drawing no. CA 02 Rev. B: Existing & Proposed Demolition Plan;
Drawing no. Proposed Layout Plan - Drawing no. TA 03 Rev. A;
Drawing no. CA 11 Rev. B: Proposed Elevations;
Drawing no. CA 07 Rev. B: Proposed Roof Plan;
Drawing no. 05 Rev. C: Details Sheet 1; and
Drawing no. 06 Rev. C: Details Sheet 2.

Except as provided for by other conditions to this permission, the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall match those of the existing building.

Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary

Development Plan.

- 4 Prior to any above-ground works details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:
- (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water;
 - (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);
 - (iii) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
 - (iv) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable; and
 - (v) Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems.

The approved schemes shall be in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) or any subsequent replacement national standards. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason. To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution to accord with Policy JP-S4: Flood Risk and the Water Environment of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
CB	20/07/2026	DM	21/7/26