

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 02/12/2021	Ref: 67560/FUL
Registration: 26/10/2021	LDfC: 30/11/2021	Expiry Date: 21/12/2021
Site Visit: 04/11/2021	Site Notice: 04/11/2021	Press Date: 04/11/2021
Objections: 3	Con Area: RAMS	Adv Type: CA
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Erection of 1 no. dwelling with attached annexe on gable

Location: Land at Carr Fold & Carr Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9EG

Description

The application relates to an area of land at Carr Fold Street, and Carr Street. The site currently overgrown and has small sheds/garages on it. The site slopes up from east to west and has a frontage onto Carr Street. There is a stone retaining wall along the Carr Street frontage with the land behind raised up by approximately 2m. Historical evidence indicates that there was a row of terraced properties on the site, fronting Carr Street.

The area is within the Ramsbottom Conservation Area and is residential in character. The adjacent property to the east is a two storey semi-detached house on the corner of Carr Street and Spring Wood Street. To the rear of the site are a row of two storey terraces fronting Spring Wood Street. To the west is an unmade access track which makes up part of footpath 278RAM, leading to the backland area to the rear of properties on Spring Wood Street. Across the access track, to the west, is a row of two storey terraced houses fronting Carr Street. To the south, across Carr Street are a further row of two storey terraced houses.

Planning permission is sought for the construction of 1 no. detached dwelling with attached annexe. The premises would front onto Carr Fold Street, with the rear of the dwelling facing the rear gardens, and rear elevations of the properties on Spring Wood Street. The proposed dwelling would have a hipped roof, with gable atriiums to the front and rear elevations. The proposed annexe would comprise of a single storey flat roof addition to the north side elevation. The proposal seeks to use stone, and slate for the external elevations.

Relevant Planning History

53920 - Demolition of existing sheds and erection of a two storey dwelling incorporating single garage - Approve with Conditions 16/06/2011

57623 - Erection of dwelling - Approve with Conditions 19/12/2014

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent to adjoining land owners 1/11/2021 and 9/11/2021

Site Notice - 4/11/2021

Press Notice - 4/11/2021

3 objections received from No. 12, 6 and 2 Grant Mews in relation to:

- The proposed size and elevation of the house is not in keeping with the surrounding properties, it would simply dwarf them and look out of place.
- Car Parking - the plans show 2 cars, but the application talks about providing 4 parking bays, and in another document states an area can be used as a turning circle. It can't really be both a parking bay and a turning circle.
- Carr Street has significant car parking issues from the existing housing stock and is

quite dangerous.

- A house of this size is likely to have a minimum of 2 resident cars, but factoring in visitors where do they park ?
- A significant amount of green space (Tree's etc) & stone walls will need to be removed to accommodate this house, and whilst some of it will be masked by existing hedges, due to it's elevation it will still be highly visible.
- This is supposed to be a conservation area
- Over-development or overcrowding of the site - and is therefore out of character for the area. In particular the 2 corners of the proposed building at the rear appear to nearly touch the boundary of the site.
- The proposed dwelling is extremely large for the plot and would not be in keeping with existing properties surrounding it. We also have concerns regarding the distance from the building to the supporting wall on Carr Street and that windows will also be looking directly into bedrooms of neighbouring properties.
- What is the proposal for the existing foliage, trees and wall, is this to be retained for privacy?
- What is the proposal for the existing street light and telegraph pole/lines?
- What are the plans for parking of contractor vehicles during proposed construction as during the summer when the area was being cleared, contractors were obstructing the entrance to Grant Mews.
- Further information would be appreciated regarding the points above.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section and Public Rights of Way Officer - Recommendation for refusal in relation to substandard visibility and access and parking arrangements and insufficient information in relation to parking/turning and the impact on the adjacent public right of way.

Conservation Officer - insufficient information contained within the submitted planning application to allow a determination to be made on heritage conservation grounds.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Desk assessment considered to be acceptable. Conditions requested in relation to the submission of a preliminary risk assessment, site investigation, details risk assessment and remediation/verification reports.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - SuDs condition requested.

Drainage - no response

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - Potential ecological issues include bats, nesting birds, invasive species and mitigation for loss of vegetation. All risks are however low enough to deal with via condition and informative.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
EN6	Conservation of the Natural Environment
EN5/1	New Development and Flood Risk
EN7/3	Water Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
HT6/2	Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

SPD11 Parking Standards in Bury
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) and 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 Policy 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 (Residential)

The National Planning Policy Framework should be treated as a significant material planning consideration and it emphasises the need for local planning authorities to boost the supply of housing to meet local housing targets in both the short and long term. The Framework maintains the emphasis on identifying a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land.

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 five year supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed (e.g. some large sites could take up to ten years to be completed). As such, latest monitoring indicates that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land and this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential developments.

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test, 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%) of 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 show that Bury has a housing delivery test result of less than 75%, and therefore this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

The proposed development is located within the urban area and there are residential dwellings surrounding the site. The site has also had previous approvals for residential development however these have since lapsed. As such, the proposed development would not conflict with the surrounding land uses and appropriate infrastructure would be available. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy H1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Layout and Design

Policy H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development requires all new residential development to make a positive contribution to the form and quality of the surrounding area. Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development seeks to ensure that new residential development will be acceptable in terms of layout in order to provide a good quality residential environment. In addition to this, Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design seeks to ensure that any proposals would not have an adverse impact on the particular character and townscape of an area. The site is also located within Ramsbottom Conservation Area. A full evaluation in relation to heritage is made later within the report.

The design of any new dwelling within the context of this street scene needs to be carefully considered, especially when reviewing the most recent updates to the NPPF with it's focus on design and the National Design Guide. The NPPF makes it clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental with Paragraph 126 stating "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."

This is further supported by the National Design Guide. The National Design Guide, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in 2019 states that well designed new development is influenced by " an appreciation and understanding of vernacular.....including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents." In terms of layout the Design Guide states that a well designed place is unlikely to be achieved by focusing just on appearance, materials and detailing of buildings and that layout, including the grain pattern of development, blocks and lots needs to be considered and relate to one another to create spaces, open spaces and buildings.

The immediate street scene is largely depicted by terraced dwellings and buildings. Some of these dwellings are set back from the highways with yards or garden areas to the front,

whilst others front directly onto the highway. Boundary treatments are made up of a mixture of soft landscaping, railings and stone walls. The area immediately to the rear of the site appears to be made up of gardens associated with the dwellings on Spring Wood Street with a bowling green located to the north west of the site. This bowling green is identified within the Ramsbottom Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan as "being built on impressive retaining walls 18ft tall at the highest corner" and providing valuable green amenity space that complement the terraced housing.

The terraces replicate the fine grain development that defines the character of Ramsbottom Conservation Area which is considered to be a good example of a Penine textile town which developed around the manufacturing and processing of cotton in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Reviewing historic mapping of the site, it appears that type of development previously occupied the site and that these properties were cleared some time between the 1930s - 1950s.

The proposed development has a much larger footprint when compared to the dwellings, and buildings that bound the site and would not replicate the traditional grain of development that is readily visible within the context of the site. The proposal is of such a large scale that there appears to be little amenity space associated with the property with the remaining land to the side and front utilised largely for parking. The footprint of the proposal, and the impact of this on the immediate street scene would have a detrimental impact on the character of the locality and is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

Unlike the previous approvals at the site, the proposed dwelling would have very little interaction with Carr Street. The introduction of a side, rather than principle elevation on this frontage would give the appearance of a dwelling that is turning it's back on a key frontage. It is also considered that the proposed street scene fails to accurately assess the importance of this frontage by failing to include the detailing on the neighbouring properties. From the proposed street scene it would appear that the neighbouring properties have blank elevations, rather than providing an active frontage. Any new dwelling on this site need to be considered in relation to the scale and massing of these existing properties, and their architectural features, to ensure that the proposal would not appear incongruous or out of keeping. Any development of this site also needs to have a clear and defined presence within this street to ensure that an active frontage is maintained which has not been met in this instance.

The proposed use of a hipped, rather than gable roof would fail to reflect the local vernacular of built form. The proposed windows would also appear to fail to reflect the vertical emphasis provided by openings visible on neighbouring properties, however without these being shown on a street scene as set out above it is difficult to fully assess. The scale and massing of the proposal when viewed in relation to the neighbouring properties appears at odds, and dominating within the street scene. Whilst the gable atriums to the front and rear do help to aid the vertical emphasis, as these have been located on elevations that are less prominent they merely add to the dominating scale of the side elevation when viewed from Carr Street.

The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan - H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In addition the proposal would introduce a discordant feature into the Ramsbottom Conservation Area where it is the intention of the Local Planning Authority to secure a high standard of development in relation to new building by requiring the use of sympathetic and compatible building forms and materials. The proposed development would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area conflicting with EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Heritage

The application site is within Ramsbottom Conservation area.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities in the exercise of their planning functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage asset assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Paragraph 195 of the NPPF requires that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

This is further supported by UDP Policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of these areas. Development will only be acceptable if it preserves or enhances these areas with regard to the nature of the development in terms of bulk, height, materials, design, relationship to the surrounding area, and impact of a new use on the character of the surrounding area. Proposals where appropriate should seek to implement measures to retain, replace, restore features of architectural interest, retain and enhance landscaping features, promote environmental enhancement and promote design guidelines to ensure sympathetic development.

The heritage statement submitted as part of the planning application does not satisfy paragraph 194 of the NPPF as it does not describe the significance of the designated heritage asset which is Ramsbottom Conservation area. The statement submitted appears to merely be a list of the listed buildings within Ramsbottom and was only submitted after the application was invalidated. It is considered this body of work should have been undertaken from the offset, so that it could inform the design rather than be a document that is retro-fitted to meet validation requirements. As such there is not sufficient information to identify and assess what affect the proposal may have on any particular significance of the heritage asset.

There are also insufficient details of the proposed dwelling with regard to its impact on the street scene with regard to the architectural grain and design of the built environment along that part of Carr Street and in particular with the proposal having a dominant scale in a dominant position.

As such there is insufficient information contained within the submitted planning application to allow a determination to be made on heritage conservation grounds.

Residential Amenity

UDP Policy H1/2 states that the council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban

area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses. UDP Policy H2/1 also requires the consideration of the impact of developments on residential amenity and the position and proximity of neighbouring properties. There are no adopted aspect standards for new build residential properties however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case.

The proposal is set at a higher level than the properties on Spring Wood Street, and would have a direct relationship with the rear elevations and gardens of No 1 - 7. No sections have been provided with the application to allow a full evaluation of the differences in height and the spot heights included on the block plans are limited to those heights within the site. Whilst the street scene provided does lack in detail in relation to features of neighbouring properties, it does show the difference in height of the proposal and shows that the proposed dwelling would be approximately 3.2 metres higher than No. 1 Spring Wood Street. As such, an extra 3 metres has been added to aspect standards as set out within SPD 6.

The proposed first floor rear windows would be located approximately 4 metres (first floor window associated with master bedroom/atrium) to 6.4 metres (bedroom window) from the directly facing rear boundary, which would not comply with the 10 metres required by SPD 6. It is also not clear what the rear boundary treatments are proposed to be and whether the ground floor windows would be screened. Again a distance of 4 metres and 6.4 metres between the bifolding doors associated with the sitting area would be below the 7 metres required by SPD 6 given the difference in heights compared with the properties to the rear. As such it is considered that the proposed rear windows would lead to undue loss of privacy to the properties at the rear.

The proposed dwelling would be located a minimum of 7.3 metres from the rear of No. 1 and No. 3 Springwood Street which is below the 16 metres required by SPD 6. As such, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would be unduly overbearing in relation to the gardens and rear habitable room windows of these properties.

The rear window of the lounge for the granny annexe would be located approximately 2 metres from the directly facing boundary with No. 5/7 Spring Wood Street, with the side glazed doors located approximately 3 metres from this boundary which is less than the 7 metres required by SPD 6 given the apparent differences in heights between the site and the neighbouring properties and the unknown boundary treatments to be provided. It is therefore considered that the rear and side habitable room windows related to the annexe would lead to undue loss of privacy.

The single storey annexe would be located approximately 3.2 metres from the rear elevation of No. 5/7 Spring Wood Street which would be below the 13 metres required by SPD 6 given the apparent differences in levels. As such, it is considered that the proposed annex would be unduly overbearing in relation to the gardens and rear habitable room windows of these properties.

The proposed front windows would be a minimum of 9 metres from the directly facing boundary exceeding the 7 metres required by SPD 6. The windows within the side elevations appear to be secondary windows or relate to non-habitable rooms and as such aspects not applied.

Ecology

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit were consulted as part of the application process and provided comments.

There are a number of small structures on the site that could theoretically provide bat roosting habitat. GMEU consider that the nature of the buildings (based on the photographs

in the contaminated land report) is such that this risk appears to be negligible for two of the structures and very low for the breeze block structure. Any roost is also likely to be day roost opportunities for individual bats. GMEU however acknowledge that this is a high risk area for bats, with high value foraging habitat nearby and numerous roosts recorded from the area, from residential properties.

In this instance however, GMEU are satisfied that given the large number of better roosting opportunities and very low risk nature of the buildings on the site, that an informative in relation to what to do if bats are found would suffice.

Potential bird nesting habitat is present on the site, in the form of scrub, the hedgerow and various structures on the site. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. GMEU therefore request a condition that limits site clearance to outside of nesting season unless a details survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out.

Sites such as this are moderate risk for japanese knotweed and himalayan balsam. None is however evident on the site photographs or streetview. GMEU therefore recommend an informative to cover the requirements of Schedule 9 part 2 the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended, Schedule 9 part 2

Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The development will result in the loss of a small area of overgrown land consisting of low and moderate value habitats and associated bird nesting habitat. This will be replaced with a dwelling and garden. Given the very small nature of the site, less than 0.1ha, GMEU would recommend that mitigation in the form of native hedge (hawthorn to match the existing hedge along the frontage and provision of bird boxes on the new build. These details can be conditioned.

Access and Parking

UDP Policy EN1/2 requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access, parking and service provision. This is further supported by UDP Policy H2/2 that requires proposals to demonstrate adequate car parking provision, access for both vehicles and pedestrians, and provision for public transport and the existence of any public rights of way, and UDP Policy HT6/2 that requires developments to reduce pedestrian/vehicular conflict.

In terms of parking standards UDP Policy HT2/4 requires all applications for development to make adequate provision for their car parking and servicing requirements . Supplementary Planning Document 11 provides parking standards for developments.

The Traffic Section have assessed the proposed plans and confirmed that the proposal would restrict visibility at the junction of Carr Fold with Carr Street to sub-standard levels, which is likely to lead to conflicts between vehicles entering and leaving the access and traffic on the adjacent adopted highway. The proposed access arrangements would therefore be detrimental to road safety and maintaining the free flow of traffic on Carr Street.

The proposed car parking/access arrangements immediately at the junction of Carr Fold with Carr Street are also identified as being sub-standard. It is considered that these arrangements are likely to lead to vehicles reversing onto the adopted highway at a hazardous location on the highway network, which would be detrimental to road safety and maintaining the free flow of traffic on Carr Street.

In addition to the road safety issues identified above the application and submitted plans are considered to contain insufficient information to ensure that adequate pedestrian access, parking arrangements and turning facilities can be provided within the curtilage of the site. A more detailed site plan would be needed to show the size and location of the parking spaces proposed and exactly how many spaces this will equate to. The submitted

plans for instance show 2 vehicles adjacent to Carr Street, and an additional parking and turning area to the north of the proposed dwelling/annex however it unclear of the exact layout of the proposed parking for the 4 vehicles that the application form states would be provided.

4 parking spaces would also exceed the maximum number of car parking spaces as set out within SPD 11 for this scale of development. No explanation of the needs of the occupant to exceed the set parking standards has been set out within the design and access statement.

The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that the proposed development will not adversely affect the integrity of the adjacent adopted highway/Public Rights of Way No.'s 42 & 278 Ramsbottom, which have not been identified or acknowledged on the submitted site plan, existing street lighting column and retaining wall located immediately adjacent to the adopted highway.

Whilst some of these issues could be addressed by the submission of amended plans showing visibility splays, and a more detailed site layout given the issues identified within the above report in relation to design, heritage and residential amenity these amendments have not been sought in this instance.

Response to Neighbours

The impact of the proposal in terms of layout and design, residential amenity and parking have been set out within the main body of the report.

A construction traffic management plan can be conditioned as part of a proposal, should the proposal be in a position to be supported. Any works required to telegraph poles and lighting columns outside of the red line would need to be agreed with the highways authority.

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, by reason of its size, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and Ramsbottom Conservation Area and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would introduce a discordant feature into the Ramsbottom Conservation Area where it is the intention of the Local Planning Authority to secure a high standard of development in relation to new building by requiring the use of sympathetic and compatible building forms and materials. The proposed development would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 The proposed street scene submitted fails to accurately show the features of the neighbouring properties and as such the application contains insufficient information to allow a full assessment of the relationship of the proposed dwelling in relation to neighbouring properties and its impact on the street scene. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan - H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 The size of the site is inadequate to accommodate the development proposed whilst satisfying reasonable requirements for space about the dwelling. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The application, heritage statement and submitted plans contain insufficient information to identify and assess what affect the proposal may have on any particular significance of the Ramsbottom Conservation Area and its impact on the street scene with regard to the architectural grain and design of the built environment along Carr Street. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan - EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and paragraphs 194 and 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 The proposed dwelling and annexe would result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of privacy currently enjoyed by the occupiers of Nos. 1, 3, 5 and 7 Spring Wood Street by reason of the sub-standard distances between habitable windows on the proposed development and the shared boundaries of these properties. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Unitary Development Plan Policies H1/2 - Further Housing Development, H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development and Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.
- 6 The proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the dwellings at Nos. 1, 3, 5 and 7 Spring Wood Street by reason of its height, size, position and sub-standard distances between the rear elevations of the proposed development and the rear elevations of the existing properties. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies H1/2 - Further Housing Development, H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development and Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.
- 7 The proposal would restrict visibility at the junction of Carr Fold with Carr Street to sub-standard levels, which is likely to lead to conflicts between vehicles entering and leaving the access and traffic on the adjacent adopted highway and would therefore be detrimental to road safety and maintaining the free flow of traffic on Carr Street. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
- 8 The proposed car parking/access arrangements immediately at the junction of Carr Fold with Carr Street are sub-standard and likely to lead to vehicles reversing onto the adopted highway at a hazardous location on the highway network, which would be detrimental to road safety and maintaining the free flow of traffic on Carr Street.

DELEGATED REPORT

The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.

- 9 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that adequate pedestrian access and parking arrangements and turning facilities can be provided within the curtilage of the site. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict, HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development and associated Supplementary Planning Document 11 - Parking Standards in Bury.
- 10 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that the proposed development will not adversely affect the integrity of the adjacent adopted highway/Public Rights of Way No.'s 42 & 278, Ramsbottom, existing street lighting column and retaining wall located immediately adjacent to the adopted highway. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
Helen Pressley	2/11/2021	DM	07/12/2021