

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 09/06/2023	Ref: 69444/FUL
Registration: 17/04/2023	LDFC: 13/05/2023	Expiry Date: 12/06/2023
Site Visit: 19/04/2023	Site Notice: 19/04/2023	Press Date: 20/04/2023
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: ARW
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: COUS

Proposal: Change of use from garage/unit into 1 no. dwelling

Location: 2 Taylors Lane, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 6QS

Description

The application relates to an existing garage unit located within the grounds of 2 Taylors Lane. The application form describes the existing use of the entire site as "small holding and garage/workshop. "The existing building is a single storey, hipped roof property constructed from random coursed stone, red brick and corrugated cement roof sheets. A flat roof extension is located to the north side of the existing building. In addition to the existing stone/brick garage unit the site also comprises of a further garage/storage unit, 2 storage containers and a caravan that the planning statement states is used in connection with horsiculture and the keeping of chickens.

Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the brick/stone built garage unit. The proposal would utilise the existing ground floor of the garage unit but would extend the roof space to create a gable roof, with 2no. dormers above the main building and a new pitched roof above the existing extension.

Relevant Planning History

16/0225 - Erection of wall/fence - 12/12/2016

Publicity

Neighbour letters 01/06/2023

Press Notice 20/04/2023

Site Notice 19/04/2023

No representations received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommendation for refusal on highway safety and access for fire service

Planning Policy Manager - No response

Drainage Section - No response

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Contaminated Land implementation of Remediation Strategy and Site Verification Report required via condition

Public Rights of Way Officer - concerns raised over intensification of the use of the public right of way

Waste Management - No response

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No response

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No ecological information has been supplied.
Recommend a bat and bird assessment of the building proposed for conversion prior to determination.

Greater Manchester Fire - No response

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

OL1	Green Belt
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN5/1	New Development and Flood Risk
EN5	Flood Protection and Defence
EN6	Conservation of the Natural Environment
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7	Pollution Control
EN9/1	Special Landscape Areas
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
H3/2	Existing Incompatible Uses
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
HT6/2	Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict
RT3/3	Access to the Countryside
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
SPD 9	Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt

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 (NPPF) should be treated as a 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.

Therefore, in relation to the proposed 86 dwellings, paragraph 11d) 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, provides a clear 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, taken as a whole.

Therefore, in this case the 'titled balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

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.

The site is located on a brownfield site and there are residential properties to the south east. The proposed development could potentially conflict with the surrounding land uses given the garage/storage use located within the red edge. The proposal site is located approximately 0.2 miles from Bury New Road which is a main road, with bus services as such the site is considered to be located within a sustainable location. Therefore, the proposed development could be considered to be in accordance with Policy H1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan provided that the proposal complies with all other material planning considerations.

Principle (Green Belt)

Paragraphs 147 and 148 state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC). Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. VSC will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings would be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- (e) limited infilling in villages;
- (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

Paragraph 150 of the NPPF also confirms that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- a) mineral extraction;
- b) engineering operations;
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;

- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
- f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Policy OL1/2 states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development, unless it is for one of more of the following purposes: agriculture and forestry essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings, provided that this would not result in a disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, or, in the case of replacement existing dwellings, the new dwelling is not materially larger than the one it replaces; limited infilling in existing villages.

Conversions are also subject to UDP Policy OL1/4 Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt. This policy states that conversion would not be inappropriate provided:

- it does not have a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt
- the building is permanent and capable of conversion without substantial rebuild.
- the massing and design is appropriate
- suitable access can be provided
- Services can be provided and
- there is not a threat to endangered species.

Supplementary Planning Document 9 (SPD9) supports this policy and gives guidance on the conversion or reuse of buildings in the Green Belt. This is further supported by Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt which state that extensions of existing dwellings should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling.

Conversion

No structural survey has been submitted with the application however a site visit confirmed that the host building appears to be of substantial construction, and could potentially be converted provided it can be demonstrated that the alterations proposed would not result in major rebuilding or reconstruction.

The proposal would require removal of the existing roof and creation of a new gable roof with dormers to facilitate accommodation within the roof space. A new pitched roof is also proposed above the existing flat roof extension. Whilst the planning statement considers that as the building has been there for over 50 years this demonstrates that the building is of substantial and permanent construction no details have been provided that indicate that foundations, existing walls etc are of suitable to bear the load of the additional roof extensions, and additional internal floor. Given the extensive building work to provide accommodation within the roof it is considered that not enough evidence has been provided that the existing building can be converted without major rebuilding or reconstruction. Therefore the application cannot be properly assessed and would be contrary to National Planning Policy Paragraph 150 and UDP Policy OL1/4, SPD8 and SPD9.

Extension

Paragraph 149 allows the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; To assist in what can be considered to be disproportionate SPD 8 considers additions of up to a third (33%). However, that is not to say something larger, or smaller than 33%, would not be supported as each case is considered on it's own merits.

The volume of the original property - 165.1m³.

The existing extension -30m³
Proposed additional volume - 19.3m³

This would equate to an overall increase of approximately 30% which aligns with the guidance set out within SPD 8. According to case law in the Court of Appeal judgement *Turner v Secretary of State* 2016 at para 14, "The concept of openness of the green belt is not narrowly limited to volumetric approach..... (in the context of which, volumetric matters may be a material concern, but are by no means the only one) and factors relevant to the visual impact on the aspects which the Green belt presents." The visual impact of the proposed alterations will be discussed below.

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.

As well as these listed policy considerations, and the Green Belt policy considerations set out above the site is also located within a Special Landscape Area as identified under UDP Policy EN9/1 which requires high standards of design, siting and landscaping and confirms that unduly obtrusive development will not be permitted in such areas.

The NPPF makes it clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental. 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."

It is accepted that a certain amount of alteration work will be necessary to accommodate modern living and working conditions. However, this work must be balanced with the need to retain important features which give the building its distinctive identity. Any alterations should not have any materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Looking at historical mapping it appears that a building has been located on this site for a number of years, and the random coursed stone walls match those of the converted barn to the south east of the site. Unfortunately at some point the existing front elevations has had some unsympathetic alterations with the insertion of red brick work and window and door openings. A window in the side elevation appears to be a later addition as there are no headers and cills to match the windows on the rear elevation that have been infilled. The existing single storey flat roof extension is also not in keeping with the simple rural aesthetic of the original stone built building.

In order to retain the character and appearance of the building the number of new window and door openings should be minimised. The proposal seeks to unblock one of the original windows on the rear elevation, enlarge the existing window in the side elevation and introduce headers and cills above this window. These openings are considered to be appropriate. The large windows at ground floor on the front elevation, and the three oversized dormers (1.9metres in width) however are considered to be less sympathetic and are more urban than rural in character. The use of anthracite colour windows, and render to this elevation further reinforces the urbanisation of this particular facade. Similarly the full height glazed doors/windows within the extension are considered to be oversized. Whilst it is noted that this elevation already has unsympathetic windows and materials, it is considered that an opportunity to resolve this has been missed. The round windows within the gables are also not in keeping with the simple form of the original building.

The introduction of a gable roof, where previously there was a pitched roof, whilst not

materially taller than the existing property, gives the impression of increased scale and massing. The introduction of dormers on the front elevation further emphasises this scale and introduces a domestic appearance which is inappropriate to the character of the original building and as such the general character of the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area. It is noted that the barn conversion to the south east of the site has dormers but these are set down below the ridge height with windows located at eaves height therefore reducing the scale.

The proposal would also see the formation of an area of garden, or domestic curtilage. The extent of garden would further emphasise the degree of domestication of the site by encouraging the siting of domestic paraphernalia such as items of garden furniture or play equipment which would cause harm to the openness.

The design of the proposed windows, dormers, roof extension, use of materials and extent of domestic curtilage is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and openness of the locality, Green Belt and Special Landscape Area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies H2/1, EN1/2, EN9/1, OL1/2, OL1/4, SPD8, SPD9 and the NPPF.

Amenity

Neighbouring 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. This is further supported by Policy H2/1 that requires an assessment 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.

There are no dwellings directly to the north, south, east or west of the proposed dwelling. Taylor's Barn is located to the south east of the site but as it is off set from the proposal no proposed windows would directly face this property.

Amenity for future occupiers

The proposed dwelling has been assessed to ensure that they would all comply with the minimum gross internal floor area requirements and associated minimum bedroom dimensions of the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' (NDSS).

For a two bed, three person property (minimum occupancy under NDSS for a 2 bed property) and overall floor space of 70m² is required. Excluding eaves storage an overall floor space of approximately 86.73m² can be provided.

Although both bedrooms are the same size, one bedroom has to be considered to be a double bedroom size. The second bedroom can be assessed against single occupancy standards.

For bedroom 1 NDSS requires a floor area of 11.5m² and a width of 2.75m. A floor area (excluding eaves storage) of 11.7m² can be provided and a width of 3.2m can be provided. For bedroom 2 NDSS requires a floor area of 7.5m² and a width of 2.15m. A floor area (excluding eaves storage) of 12.6m² can be provided and a width of 3m can be provided. It would appear that the proposal would comply with NDSS standards however no section has been provided of the dwelling to confirm that the minimum floor to ceiling height is 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area.

In this instance, given that Bury do not currently have a local plan policy that requires applicant's to adhere to NDSS and the apparent compliance when measuring floor plans the proposed internal layout is considered to be acceptable.

The existing site is currently used as a small holding, with a garage/storage unit, 2 storage containers and a caravan that the planning statement states is used in connection with horticulture and the keeping of chickens. UDP Policy H3/2 - Existing Incompatible Uses states that where existing incompatible uses operate within residential areas, the Council will seek to ensure that any existing conflicts are resolved where possible and where opportunities arise.

Whilst the site is not in a residential area, it is currently unclear how the existing and proposed uses will balance on site. That said the uses are all contained within the red edge of the application site and as such appear to be under the control of the applicant, within the same planning unit which should minimise areas of conflict and potential nuisance.

Ecology

UDP Policy EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment states that The Council will retain, protect and enhance the natural environment of the Borough, particularly in relation to areas of ecological, wildlife and geological importance. In addition to this EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value states that the effect of land use changes on existing features of ecological or wildlife value will be taken into account when assessing development proposals. Any proposal should seek to retain such features and incorporate them into the development. Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment of the National Planning Policy Framework also requires planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.

No ecological information has been supplied with the planning application. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit have been consulted as part of the application and require a bat and bird assessment of the building proposed for conversion prior to determination. As the principle of development is not considered to be acceptable this information has not been requested during the application process.

As bats and nesting birds are protected it is considered that the application and submitted plans contains insufficient information in relation to essential ecological surveys in relation to bats and nesting birds. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies: EN6 , EN6/3 and the NPPF.

Access and Parking

UDP Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access, parking and service provision. This is further supported by UDP Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development 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 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict that requires developments to reduce pedestrian/vehicular conflict.

The plot can be accessed by public right of way 46CC footpath, also known as Taylors Lane. As such UDP Policy RT3/3 - Access to the Countryside is also applicable as it requires the Council to seek to improve and extend the existing network of Public Rights of Way. The applicant has not demonstrated that they have private vehicular rights over the public right of way.

Whilst private rights of access would be a non-material planning consideration, the proposal would potentially intensify the use of the public rights of way through the introduction of more traffic and intensification of the existing site outside of agricultural use. It is acknowledged that the applicant already accesses the site for the existing use, but as the application proposes to add additional uses to the site there is potential for further traffic.

Visits to the site by the case officer confirms that the public right of way that could be used to access the site is not ideal for vehicular traffic.

In order to maintain the existing network of public rights of ways, and to ensure that the vehicles required to deliver materials to site, and construct the proposal do not negatively impact on the condition of the footpath a condition could be attached to provide a dilapidation survey of footpath in the event that subsequent remedial works are required following construction of the development.

In addition to the above the Traffic Section have reviewed the proposed layout and consider that the car parking and turning arrangements within the curtilage of the site, relative to the fencing and gating features shown are sub-standard and could lead to vehicles reversing out onto the adjacent public right of way. The entrance to the site is located on a bend of this public right of way where visibility when reversing out of the site would be limited. As such the proposal is considered to be detrimental to highway safety.

UDP Policy H2/2 requires proposals to consider design for safety and security. This is further supported by NPPF chapter 8. As there is limited access to the site Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue have been consulted on the application. Whilst no response has been given for this particular site, they do have standard advice needs to be met to ensure that vehicular access for fire appliances can be made within 45 metres of all points within the proposed dwellings. No details have been provided by the applicant as to whether these measures can be met, and no provision for sprinklers appears to have been included within the application. Whilst this information could be asked for during the application period, as with other areas that are lacking within the application pack this information has not been requested due to the acknowledged lack of principle of development and the details could not be dealt with via means of condition.

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 site is located within an area of high accessibility as set out within SPD 11. 2 bed properties within high access areas would be required to provide a maximum of 1.5 parking spaces. As these standards are a maximum, the 2 parking spaces per dwelling that are proposed within the curtilage of the site are considered to be acceptable.

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 application and submitted plans contain insufficient information with regard to how the structural integrity of the existing building would be retained without substantial or complete rebuilding in the context of the proposed development. Therefore the application cannot be properly assessed and would be contrary to National Planning Policy Paragraph 150 and UDP Policy OL1/4 Conversions and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and associated guidance in Supplementary

DELEGATED REPORT

Planning Documents SPD8 New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt and SPD9 Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt.

- 2 The design of the proposed windows, dormers, roof extension, use of materials and extent of domestic curtilage is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and openness of the locality, Green Belt and Special Landscape Area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, EN9/1 - Special Landscape Areas, OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt, OL1/4 Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt, Supplementary Planning Document 8- New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document 9 - Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework - Protecting Green Belt land.
- 3 The application and submitted plans contains insufficient information in relation to essential ecological surveys in relation to bats and nesting birds. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies: EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment, EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value, Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The proposed car parking and turning arrangements within the curtilage of the site relative to the fencing and gating features shown on submitted plan reference RC1120 Revision 2A are sub-standard and could lead to vehicles reversing out onto the adjacent Public Footpath No. 46, Christ Church, Radcliffe, which would be detrimental to highway safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies: EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.
- 5 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that adequate fire and rescue access is achievable in relation to the safety of the future occupiers. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and National Planning Policy Framework Chapter 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP	09/06/2023	HL	09/06/23