

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 24/10/2025	Ref: 72082/PIP
Registration: 24/09/2025	LDFC: 22/10/2025	Expiry Date: 29/10/2025
Site Visit:	Site Notice: 08/10/2025	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 7	Con Area:	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for proposed residential development between 7 to 9 no. dwellings

Location: Land to south of 390 Manchester Road, Ramsbottom, BL9 5NB

Description

The site relates to a grassed field, which is located adjacent to the west of Manchester Road.

The M66 motorway forms the boundary to the south and there are residential properties to the east. There is an office building and haulage yard to the north and the Red Hall Hotel is located to the north east.

The applicant seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up between 7 and 9 No. dwellings.

A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing-led development which separately assesses the consideration of principle for proposed development 'Stage 1', from the technical detail of the development 'Stage 2'. This application relates to the Stage 1 of the process, to establish the principle aspect of the development for residential on this site.

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 details or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP. The application does include a Planning Statement.

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

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

None relevant.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 30 September 2025 and site notices were posted on 8 October 2025.

7 letters have been received, which have raised the following issues:

- Removal of green field for properties will be detrimental to water drainage in the area. This road suffers from flooding at various places along its length.
- Access to the development is likely to be too close to other junctions with the main road, causing even more risk considering proximity of the M66 J1 slip road, which is already a dangerous area for any traffic joining the A56 main road from the other existing side roads and driveways.
- As there is also a large scale planned development of homes at Walmersley Brook, the extra traffic in the area will already be substantially increased without any roadway improvements or risk mitigations.
- Concerned about the proposed design of the 9 properties and in particular whether the development will affect our line of sight, create disruption during construction, or impact existing facilities in the area.
- Another developer trying to take advantage of Labours lacklustre approach to green belt rules. There is already an application for further down Walmersley Road so before long the town of Ramsbottom will merge into the outskirts of Bury town centre if these developments are permitted.
- The traffic along Manchester road into and out of Ramsbottom is already a nightmare, this is before the new housing development on Bolton Street is finished.
- There is STILL no high school in the Walmersley area so with more housing this will cause overcrowding in the existing schools closest to here i.e Woodhey. The same goes for Primary schools, classes are already oversubscribed yet there are no plans to expand capacity in the local area.
- Finally, Greenbelt should not be built on. Walmersley is loosing too much of it's natural environment causing damage to the local wildlife.
- Do they not understand the the majority of people in the area do not want more housing
- This will only increase pressure on the local infrastructure doctors, dentist, water, buses, roads, buses etc etc.
- The appetite for this is not there, hopefully they will remember we are the ones who will vote for them in the future.
- The Borough of Bury has signed up to the Places for Everyone plan. The whole point of that plan is to control speculative development and focus on agreed sites for building.
- Places for Everyone is there to protect non designated land from exactly this type of random development. The applicant may say that the development is insignificant enough not to infringe green belt etc. but if this application receives consent then there will surely be more applications.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Object due to substandard access arrangements.

Drainage Section - No objections in principle.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objections in principle.

GM Ecology Unit - No objections in principle.

United Utilities - No objections in principle.

Designforsecurity - No response.

GM Fire Service - No response.

Transport for GM - No response.

Pre-start Conditions - Applicant/Agent [Not relevant/has/has not] agreed with pre-start conditions

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
EN1/7	Throughroutes and Gateways
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN8/2	Woodland and Tree Planting
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
OL4/2	Protection of Farm Holdings
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S3	Heat and Energy Networks
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G2	Green Infrastructure Network
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New 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 between 7 and 9 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 by PfE Policy JP-G9 and as a result any development on the site is subject to NPPF Paragraph 154 and 155.

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, including harm to its openness.

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 one of the listed exceptions apply.

Whilst the development of the site could be partially acceptable under 154 (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. However, in this case, a significant portion of the site is not previously developed and comprises only temporary structures. Therefore, the proposed development does not meet any exceptions listed within paragraph 154.

Paragraph 155 states that the development of homes should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- 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 the NPPF; 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 and as considered above, a small fraction of the site comprises previously developed land. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to the following purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 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. In particular, paragraph 005 of the guidance sets out the key considerations to inform judgements as to whether land is grey belt (Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - The guidance is clear that this relates to the sprawl of large built-up areas, not villages.

The site is currently free of existing development and lacks physical features that would contain and restrict development further than the existing site boundary, although beyond that it is contained by the M66 motorway to the south, the A56 to the east, and the existing development to the north. Additionally, the site is not adjacent to a large built-up area.

Therefore, it is considered that the site makes a limited contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighboring towns merging - The guidance is clear that this relates to the merging of towns, not villages. The site does not contribute toward maintaining a gap between towns, nor does it contribute to visual separation of towns. As such, it is considered that this site makes no contribution toward preventing the merging of neighbouring towns.

Grey belt conclusion - 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.

Following reference to the guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 64-008-20250225), it is considered that the development of the site in principle 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.

Based on the 2024 5-year supply statement, the Council has demonstrated 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.

NPPF paragraph 80 requires the latest published HDT results to be used. However, the Government is currently operating to a delayed publication timetable for the HDT, and although the latest published results for 2023 are below 75%, based on the current HDT rulebook Bury's result for 2024 will be above 75% and the tilted balance will no longer be triggered by the housing delivery test result.

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.

- In this regard, PfE Policy JP-C1: An Integrated Network sets relevant advice, supporting: Patterns of development that minimises both the need to travel and the distance travelled by unsustainable modes to jobs, housing and other key services, including healthcare, education, retail, recreation and leisure facilities, green space and green infrastructure; and
- Locating and designing development, to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport;

Whilst there are frequent bus services on the A56 to Bury, Ramsbottom and further afield, the site is located 1.3 miles from the closest town centre at Ramsbottom (supermarkets, pharmacies, GP, schools and post office) and a similar distance to local services on Walmersley Road. Both equate to a 30-minute walk and ultimately, the proposed development would be car-led development as there are no local services within walking distance. Given the size and location of the development, it is also unlikely that any real active travel links or improvements could be provided to make it a sustainable location.

As such, the development would not be focussed on a location that is, or can be made, sustainable and the proposal fails to meet criterion C.

Green Belt conclusion - Whilst the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt land, the proposal would not be focused in a location that is or can be made sustainable for the type of development proposed and therefore fails to meet NPPF paragraph 154 criterion c).

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

Efficient use of land

PfE Policy JP-H4 - Requires ne - 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 applies.

The total site area is circa 0.09 hectares. 7 dwellings would equate to 77 dwellings per hectare and 9 dwellings would equate to 100 dwellings per hectare.

Therefore, the site would meet the density requirements as set out in Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Conclusion - The site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land but would fail to satisfy criterion c as it would not be in a sustainable location.

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

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

Consultation responses

Highways

The proposal would result in the creation of sub-standard access arrangements onto the A56 Manchester Road at a hazardous location on the highway network in close proximity to the start of the filter lane for the south-bound slip road at Junction 1 of the M66, existing junction on the easterly side of Manchester Road and existing north-bound bus stop, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and road safety on a high speed Class 1 road.

Drainage

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.

We strongly recommend that the applicant or any subsequent developer contacts United Utilities, using our 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 5.0 'Contacts'.

DRAINAGE - Directed by the principles set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance and the new National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) we require developers and Local Planning Authorities, to do all that they can to avoid surface water entering the public sewer, unless absolutely necessary. This applies to all proposed development. See Appendix 1.1 'Surface Water Hierarchy'.

All options for the sustainable management of surface water must be thoroughly investigated before we will accept any surface water connections from new development to the public sewer. Where a new surface water connection to the public sewer is proposed, we will require robust evidence to demonstrate the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and there are no more sustainable options available for the management of surface water.

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 below. 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.

We request FULL drainage details are provided at Technical Detail Consent stage

To discuss their drainage proposals the applicant should contact our Developer Services team by email at SewerAdoptions@uuplc.co.uk. Alternative ways to contact the team are detailed in the Appendix, Section 6.0 'Contacts'.

Please note, United Utilities is not responsible for advising on rates of discharge to the local watercourse system. This is a matter for discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority and / or the Environment Agency (if the watercourse is classified as a main river).

Management and maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

Without effective management and maintenance SuDS can fail or become ineffective which may have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area, including the performance of the public sewer network (where the two systems interact). Therefore, where SuDS is included in a proposed development, we recommend the Local Authority include a condition relating to SuDS management and maintenance in any subsequent Decision Notice. An example condition is included with the Appendix, Section 2.2.

When considering their drainage proposal, it is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the existence of any infrastructure that might impact their detailed design. This includes water, wastewater, operational and/or abandoned pipelines. United Utilities will not routinely carry out this assessment when reviewing drainage proposals submitted within a planning application. Where infrastructure exists, the drainage design must comply with the relevant United Utilities guidelines and/or Building Regulations. Further information is available on our website: Working near our pipes - United Utilities. Failure to consider existing infrastructure when designing a drainage proposal may result in the applicant having to redesign proposals at a later date.

UNITED UTILITIES' PROPERTY, ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Easement

According to our records there is an easement located at the northern boundary of the proposed development site which is in addition to our statutory rights for inspection, maintenance and repair. The easement dated 03/05/1957 UU Ref: P 358 has restrictive covenants that must be adhered to. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain a copy of the easement document, available from United Utilities Legal Services or Land Registry. The applicant must comply with the provisions stated within the document.

Water main

A large diameter trunk main crosses the site. Various other large diameter trunk mains are located within the vicinity of the site. Our water assets must not be built over, nor have our access to the pipeline compromised in any way. We require an access strip as detailed in our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines', which can be found on our website:

<https://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers/your-development/planning/building-over-or-working-near-our-assets/working-near-our-pipes/>. The applicant must comply with this document to ensure pipelines are adequately protected both during and after the construction period.

Our assets must be considered during the detailed design phase of any future application. Our water assets (and associated easements) will be a material consideration for future layouts at this site, and will likely affect the number of proposed dwellings as a result. Should permission in principle be granted, and subsequent applications be submitted, we expect the applicant to find the proven location of our water asset. This should be incorporated in future site plans, with our water asset overlaid to ensure that sufficient access is provided to our asset. Without the provision of this information, it is highly likely that we will **OBJECT** to subsequent applications.

Given the size and nature of the pipeline concerned, we strongly recommend that if they have not already done so, the applicant contacts our Water Developer Services team at the earliest opportunity for advice on determining the precise location of the pipeline and

additional protection measures they must consider both during and after construction.

To discuss the proposal in relation to the water main we recommend the applicant contacts our Water Developer Services team by email at DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk. If direct communication, between the applicant and our Developer Services team, results in an acceptable solution to address our current objection, the applicant must submit any agreed details to the Council for formal consideration. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the Council have all information that is relevant to their application.

It is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the existence of any pipelines that might cross or impact their proposed site and also to demonstrate the exact relationship between United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. The applicant should not rely solely on the detail contained within asset maps when considering a proposed layout.

It is important that the supporting information contained in the Appendix, Section 3.0 'United Utilities' Property, Assets and Infrastructure', is read in conjunction with this letter. This provides information that might impact a proposed layout and additional guidance that an applicant or developer must consider when United Utilities assets are located in, or in the locality of, the proposed site.

Where United Utilities' assets exist, it is essential that the applicant, or any subsequent developer, contacts our Developer Services team prior to commencing any works on site, including trial holes, groundworks or demolition. See Appendix, Section 6.0 'Contacts'.

WATER EFFICIENCY IN NEW DEVELOPMENT

All new homes are required to meet the mandatory national standard of 125 litres of water used per person per day (l/p/d) as set out in Building Regulations Approved Document G. If your adopted development plan includes a policy that implements the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 l/p/d for new-build dwellings in Part 3 of Building Regulations, you should ensure that this is a condition of any planning permission you may grant. You should also consider whether there is any adopted development plan policy relating to water efficiency in the construction of non-residential development. As this is a matter for the local planning authority / building control body, United Utilities would not be involved in the discharge of conditions relating to water efficiency.

Type, Size and Design of New Housing

PfE Policy JP-H3 - Seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes. All new dwellings must 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. The accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations would need to be secured by condition.

Landscape Character Area

The site is within the Knowl and Rooley Moors, Fringes and Foothills (LCA24), an area of Pennine Foothills (West/South Pennines) as assessed by the GM Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment.

Policy JP-G1: Landscape Character states that development within a Landscape Character Type should reflect and respond to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key landscape characteristics of its location, including having regard to:

- Topography, geology and drainage;
- Land use and field patterns;
- Semi-natural habitats and woodland cover;
- Archaeology and cultural heritage;
- Settlement, road pattern and rights of way; and
- Views and perceptual qualities.

The interface of new development with the surrounding countryside/landscape is of particular importance. These transitional areas require well-considered and sensitive treatment. In particular, opportunities to improve the intactness and condition of the landscape should be taken. This would be required at technical details stage.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land

It is noted that this is a Stage 1 Permission in Principle application to establish the principle of development. As such conditions cannot be recommended, but we raise comments below regarding the information required for submission at the subsequent Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage. The proposal is for between 7 to 9 no. dwellings.

Historical mapping does not indicate that the site has been previously developed but 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 in Bury Council's Developers Guide and on the Planning Portal.

Air Quality

It is noted that this is a Stage 1 Permission in Principle application to establish the principle of development. As such conditions cannot be recommended, but we raise comments below regarding the information required for submission at the subsequent Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage. The proposal is for between 7 to 9 no. dwellings.

For this type of development, it would be expected that parking would be included. The site is located adjacent to 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 100 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the EPUK 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 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.

Ecology

We are unaware of any ecological issues for this site that would prevent permission in principle. The main ecological issue is likely to be biodiversity net gain.

Protected Species - There appear to be no buildings or mature trees on site that could provide bat roosting opportunities and no ponds with habitat connectivity. The only theoretical risk to a protected species is to badger, known to be present in the locality.

As part of any planning application, we would recommend provision of a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA).

Nesting Birds and Other Wildlife - There is a theoretical risk of nesting birds and other wildlife utilising the site. The PEA would be expected to assess the level of risk to other wildlife.

Invasive Species - Species such as Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed could be present. The PEA would be expected to report on the presence or absence of such species.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The development will result in the loss of an area of low to moderate value grassland to development. The field appears to have been through a period of abandonment from around 2000 to 2020, with the field having undergone some management over the last five years. There are unlikely to be any significant wildlife issues.

10% biodiversity net gain will likely apply. Depending upon the site boundary, it will be very unlikely that 10% net gain can be achieved on the site and off-site credits would need to be purchased. As part of any planning application a BNG assessment and metric should be provided or a BNG statement if they believe the development is covered by an exemption.

The incorporation of bird bricks in line with the developing Bury Local Plan is recommended for each proposed dwelling.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would not be located in a sustainable location and would fail the tests set out in Paragraph 155 (c) in relation to Grey Belt Land. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HL - 24/10/2025		HL - 28/10/2025	

