

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 27/08/2026	Ref: 73467/PIP
Registration: 24/07/2026	LDfC: 19/08/2026	Expiry Date: 28/08/2026
Site Visit: 03/08/2026	Site Notice: 03/08/2026	Press Date: 06/08/2026
Objections: 10	Con Area: RAMS	Adv Type: CAAF
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIOT

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the construction of up to 9 no. zero carbon dwellings

Location: Land on the west side of Bury New Road/Peel Brow, Ramsbottom, BL0 0AZ

Description

The site relates to an area of land, which is 0.2 hectares in size and is covered with trees, which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The site is located in the river valley. There is a residential dwelling to the south with trees beyond and trees to the north, with a builders yard beyond. Bury New Road forms the boundary to the east with residential dwellings beyond. The wooded site slopes down to the River Irwell to the west.

The applicant seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up to 9 dwellings, which will be zero carbon homes.

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. Other documents have been submitted, which would normally be required at technical details stage:

- Illustrative layout
- Heritage statement
- Phase 1 geo-environmental desk study
- Remediation strategy

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

73182 - Application in permission in principle for erection of up to 9 no. dwellings at land on west side of Bury New Road/Peel Brow, Ramsbottom. Refused - 18 June 2026.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 29 July 2026 and a press notice was published on 6 August 2026. Site notices were posted on 3 August 2026.

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

- This land was used for tipping cinders and waste from the paper mill that was the other side of River Irwell. There were several large hole on this site in the 1960 and 1970. So it is not stable land.
- It is also lower than the existing road level on Bury New Road, which slopes down towards Peel Brow, so any properties with access onto Bury New Road are likely to get rainwater flowing down their drives from the road and possibly into the houses too ... but certainly the parking areas towards the river could be a water trap.
- Traffic moves quickly on that small stretch of straight road, so two new points of access could be downright dangerous.
- At the back of the properties there is a sheer drop to the river - this land is tipped land held together by the trees and foliage. Will this be fenced off for safety?
- There is an established right of way across this site to Nuttall Park, the patch is used by dog walkers etc.
- It is a haven for wildlife and is part of Ramsbottom's charm. I do not believe it is suitable land for development.
- At one time Bury Council had earmarked this section of land for road widening to make better access to Peel Bridge, as well as reducing the accident risk at the Peel Brow / Bury New Road junction.
- This area was designated as part of Ramsbottom Conservation Area some time ago, but that seems to have been overlooked.
- I live in Ramsbottom and the traffic is already horrendous coming down Bury New Road into the town centre. It is a bottle neck so more traffic coming out onto this road would make it worse.
- There is a lot of wildlife especially birds on this piece of land & some of these birds have already been displaced from across the river at the old Mondi Mill site.
- That piece of land is full of Japanese knotweed & this invasive weed needs to be removed using chemicals - what will the environmental impact of that removal be on the land and surrounding area?
- Traffic safety / traffic flow concerns - given the location, traffic approaching in either direction are approaching from blind bends .
- Parking is insufficient which will lead to the same old problems. A build is approved without insufficient parking leading to cars being abandoned on the street, often on the pavement. At this particular location vehicles being abandoned on the road will create traffic flow problems. Since a number of houses opposite this site have recently sold , the new occupiers have brought more vehicles with them than were here previously and not enough off street parking. Cars are now parking on the stretch of road opposite this site, even as far as the bend forcing traffic out into the centre. This proposal will add to this problem by way of insufficient parking being provided. 9 houses- 18 parking spaces minimum
- While I support sustainable housing and the principle of low-carbon development, I have concerns about the suitability of this site and the impact the scheme may have on the local environment and community.
- Firstly, the site contains protected trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order and established vegetation that contribute significantly to the character of this important gateway into Ramsbottom. The description of the site as "unkempt" does not diminish its ecological or visual value. Development could result in the loss of habitat, biodiversity

and mature tree cover.

- Secondly, the proposal would urbanise a wooded and attractive approach to the town. The existing natural landscape contributes positively to local character and should be protected. The replacement of this green space with housing, roads and hardstanding would cause lasting visual harm.
- I am also concerned about the site's historical use. Planning documents state that it may previously have been associated with the former paper mill and may have been used as a refuse tip. This raises questions regarding contamination, ground stability and the site's suitability for residential development. These matters should be fully investigated before any permission is granted.
- Furthermore, the site's proximity to the River Irwell warrants careful consideration. Given increasing flood risks associated with climate change, it is essential that flood risk, drainage and surface water management are thoroughly assessed to ensure the development does not create additional risks for future residents or neighbouring areas.
- The proposal would also generate additional traffic on Bury New Road and Peel Brow. The cumulative impact should be considered alongside the nearby development of 57 homes currently under construction, particularly in relation to traffic, infrastructure and local services.
- For these reasons, I believe the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area, protected trees, biodiversity, local infrastructure and potentially public safety. I therefore respectfully request that Bury Council refuse this application or require substantial further assessment before reaching a decision
- Application shows ambitious over development of poor quality land.
- The site was used for tipping waste from former paper mill & is in part cinders, waste paper & waste plastics. This means for responsible development foundations would need piling & ground beams or rafts.
- The established development of west side of Bury New Road has just two properties. One (on made up ground) suffered differential settlement between main structure & garage which required underpinning to correct, & the recent extension of that property (on made up ground) required piling.
- Unclear if the developer intends to import material on site to create new levels, but some such considerations would be needed for the feeder roads due to differences in site level & road levels.
- Any construction work would impact on traffic as materials are delivered to site & with general construction traffic. Where will contractors park during construction? Surely not on Bury New Road. The compact nature of the site has little potential for on site storage or parking unless it was developed in 2 stages, which is not ideal.
- If completed, how will the site be serviced, including refuse collections?
- The T shaped access roads are likely to be congested & have limited scope for large vehicles turning within the T. This could mean such vehicles would have to reverse onto, or off, the site, which is a poor consideration & potential safety hazard for a busy main road.
- The access layout for this site is poorly thought out & the size of the development puts profit before safety. Even scaled back any development is compromised.
- The road is heavily used by cars and HGVs who all drive quickly. The access would be dangerous.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Object.

Drainage Section - No objections.

Waste Management - No response.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Object.

Conservation Officer - No objections in principle.

GM Ecology Unit - Object - Need a preliminary ecological appraisal to assess the ecological constraints.

United Utilities - No objections in principle.

Strategic Planning & Infrastructure - Object.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
H1/2	Further Housing Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/7	Throughroutes and Gateways
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN8/1	Tree Preservation Orders
EN8/2	Woodland and Tree Planting
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
RT3/2	Additional Provision for Recreation in the Countryside
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD1	Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-G3	River Valleys and Waterways
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
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 9 zero carbon dwellings. Consideration of PiP applications are limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

Consultations of 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

RIVER VALLEY - Policy OL5/2 states that within the River Valleys, new buildings or the change of use of

existing buildings or the change of use of land will not be permitted. The only exceptions considered acceptable will be those where the development would not lead to the division of the open parts of the valleys into sections and it falls within the terms below:

- a. where the area is designated as Green Belt the established Green Belt policies will apply; or
- b. where the area does not form part of the Green Belt, at least one of the following circumstances is met:
 - that the development represents limited infilling to an established valley settlement or industrial area;
 - that it is an extension to, or renewal of an existing industry, where the economic and employment factors are of overriding importance;
 - that the development is required in association with an outdoor recreation or appropriate tourist facility;
 - that the development is limited and will form part of, and be essential to, the maintenance of the provision and improvement of public services and utilities;
 - any other development that would be appropriate in the Green Belt.

The site is not located within the Green Belt, so Green Belt policies do not apply in this case.

In the context of the surrounding area, including the ongoing Willow Bank development (planning ref: 70222) comprising 57 dwellings, the site is well contained by existing built form. It is now effectively enclosed by development, forming a self-contained parcel of land within the wider settlement.

As a result, the proposal can be viewed as limited infilling within an established valley settlement. It would sit comfortably within the existing built-up area and would not extend development into open countryside. This results in the development satisfying Policy OL5/2 and therefore being acceptable in principle.

RESIDENTIAL - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions.

NPPF Policy S3 sets out the presumption in favour of development and distinguishes between development within settlements and development outside settlements.

This application is within a settlement, therefore NPPF Policy S4 applies. This states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework.

NPPF Policy HO7 gives substantial weight to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.

NPPF Annex D paragraph 8 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 an appropriate buffer. The supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in the development plan where this is 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.

The buffer applicable to the five year supply assessment is based on NPPF Annex D paragraph 9. In Bury's case, a 5% buffer is required in accordance with paragraph 9c.

A 20% buffer is no longer required because:

- the latest Housing Delivery Test result exceeds 85% (NPPF Annex D paragraph 9b: 2025 result = 114%); and
- the collective PfE requirement for all 9 PfE districts exceeds 80% of the LHN for those 9 districts (NPPF Annex D paragraph 9c: 10,305 PfE target against LHN of 12,470 = 83%).

The Council has carried out an assessment of the housing land supply to determine whether sites meet the deliverability tests in the NPPF and can contribute to the five year supply of housing land. Based on the 2025 5-year supply, a supply of 2,231 homes has been identified for the period from 2025-2030. This is set against a requirement for 2,270 homes (including a 5% buffer and having taken account of past over delivery). The Council can therefore demonstrate a 4.9 year supply of housing land including a 5% buffer (or 4.7 years if past over delivery is excluded). There is therefore currently a slight shortfall in the five year supply against the adopted housing requirement. The proposal for up to 9

dwelling would make a small positive contribution to the housing land supply, which weighs in favour of the application.

The site is located within a settlement and outside of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.

CONTAMINATED LAND - As noted in the Supporting Statement, historical mapping indicates that the site has been subject to waste disposal (albeit prior to Waste Management Legislation). Environmental Health - Contaminated Land Section also has historical information indicating that foundry waste and ash from the local mills may have been deposited in this location. Furthermore, the Council is aware that a recent appeal (Appeal reference 6004286) relating to the refusal of a PiP application on land subject to waste disposal was dismissed.

It is noted that a Phase 1 report and Remediation statement have been submitted with the application. However, there is still uncertainty regarding the ground conditions at the site, as an intrusive investigation and risk assessment has yet to be completed.

Insufficient information regarding land instability and contamination has been provided to demonstrate that the site can be developed safely. The consultant concluded in the Preliminary Risk Assessment that, *'the overall risk from soil contamination to future residential end users is concluded to be HIGH.'*

Given the absence of an intrusive investigation to fully determine the risks in relation to land instability and contamination it is not possible at this stage to determine whether or not the location of the application is suitable. The Environmental Health - Contaminated Land Section objects to this permission in principle application. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy P2 of Chapter 17 of the NPPF.

In addition, the purpose of a PiP application is to establish the principle of the development and the detailed elements of the proposal would be assessed at technical details stage. As such, if detailed reports are required to try to establish that the land is suitable in principle, this goes beyond looking at the principle only. It is considered that a PiP application may not be the best type of application for this site and an outline or full application may be more suitable.

ECOLOGY - The development falls within the Irwell Valley, which is protected under UDP policy EN6/4 and falls within the Greater Manchester Nature Network. GMEU have objected on the basis that there are ecological reasons to object, which could prevent the development being viable, unless strong evidence is provided to justify that mitigation can be provided. Such strong evidence would go beyond the principle of the application and as such, it is suggested that a PiP application is not the right type of application and a full or outline application should be submitted.

Second, the site is wooded and will have potential to provide habitat for protected species, such as badgers. There may be mature trees on the site capable of providing bat roosting habitat and the development is in close proximity to the River Irwell, where otter are known to be present. The risks are therefore high enough that accepting permission in principle could theoretically result in an illegal permission if protected species were subsequently found on the site as part of technical details that could not be resolved via a license.

"Current guidance states it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development is established before the planning permission is granted otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision (UK Government Guidance within the ODPM Government Circular 06/2005)"

Finally, the development is woodland, which is likely to be of moderate ecological value but potentially could be high ecological value, which would be replaced primarily with negligible and low value habitats. There is the potential for a significant net loss at the site level that would require the purchase of a significant off-site contribution that could make the development unviable.

Given the above, GMEU do not regard permission in principle as being the correct type of application for this site, due to the potential ecological constraints and recommend that the application is withdrawn and resubmitted as an outline or full application with a preliminary ecological appraisal submitted as a minimum.

Given the above, there is insufficient information to determine whether the site would be acceptable in principle from an ecological perspective and would conflict with Policies EN6/3 and EN6/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy N2 - Improving the Natural Environment of the NPPF.

CHARACTER - The application site is heavily treed and the trees are all protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This treed landscape contributes positively to the character of the town centre and the Conservation Area. The proposed development is likely to require significant tree removal, which would have a harmful impact upon the visual character of the town centre and conservation area. Therefore, the proposed development would not be appropriate in terms of location as it would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area and Policies EN2/1 and EN2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan

Housing

Density - The NPPF Policy L3 expects development proposals to make efficient use of land, taking into account the identified need for different types of housing, local market conditions, the availability of infrastructure (including that supporting sustainable transport modes), a site's connectivity and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

Within settlements NPPF Policy L3(2)(a) expects development proposals to contribute to an increase in the density of the area in which they are situated. The only exception is where there is a clear justification that this is either inappropriate or not possible (for example, where the prevailing density is already very high, the nature of the accommodation required precludes higher densities, or where it would conflict with other policies in this Framework). In considering the potential to increase densities, the existing character of an area should be taken into account, in accordance with NPPF policy DP3, but should not preclude development which makes the most of an area's potential.

The site is in a sustainable location, in close proximity to Ramsbottom Town Centre and with good access to sustainable transport modes.

PfE policy JP-H4 requires new 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, with this site falling in an area where a minimum net residential density of 70 dwellings per hectare applies.

As stated in the planning statement, the red edge of the site covers an area of approximately 0.49 hectares, so development at 70dph would equate to 34 dwellings. (Note that the density has been calculated on the area quoted in the planning statement, rather than the less accurately measured area used in the previous application).

The proposal is for up to 9 dwellings. 9 dwellings would equate to 18 dwellings per hectare, which is significantly below the PfE policy requirement and fails to make efficient use of land.

The indicative development area on the indicative layout equates to circa 0.3 hectares, which avoids the steeper land adjacent to 40 Bury New Road and takes account of the need to give consideration to the TPO trees at Stage 2, so even when this is accounted for (albeit that as a PiP application, this is not set at this stage), the density would be only 30 dwellings per hectare.

Policy JP-H4 allows for lower densities where they can be clearly justified by:

1. Local housing market issues, such as a demonstrable need for a particular type of housing that cannot be delivered at a higher density; or
2. Site-specific issues, such as the design context and any potential impact on the wider landscape or townscape including heritage assets and green infrastructure.

The Bury Housing Need and Demand Assessment (2025) indicates that Boroughwide, the greatest needs for market housing are for 2 and 3 bedroom properties, with the strongest demand being for 3-bed houses. In North Bury, for market housing the greatest demand is for 3-bedroom houses, followed by 4-bed houses. There is also some demand for 1 and 2 bedroom properties. There are not considered to be particular local housing market issues that would warrant development at a low density.

The site's designation as river valley and wildlife links and corridors does not automatically justify a lower density, as the site could accommodate a larger number of smaller units without increasing the impact, rather than 9 dwellings as shown on the indicative planning layout accompanying the application.

Although there are existing low density homes up the hill to the south of the site, the area is characterised by terraced properties - including a row of terraced properties directly opposite the application site, as well as those along Peel Brow and Derby Street, and therefore a higher density would be consistent with the design context. A higher density could be achieved through a mix of terraced properties or (subject to heritage considerations) small scale apartments as seen opposite the site (such as at 1 to 4 Peel Court).

The applicant's supporting statement references the development under construction at the Former Mondi site (Willow Bank, planning ref 70222) at around 35dph. However this was a derelict brownfield site with site specific issues, including flood issues, car parking, archaeological / heritage issues and the impact upon the Conservation Area, and on balance this density was accepted for this specific site. The Mondi development is not considered to set a precedent for lower density on the application site. In any event, even when accounting for the indicative area of 0.3 hectares from the indicative layout, the proposed density is only 30 dwellings per hectare, and is lower than that achieved on the Mondi site.

The development of the application site at a density of 18-30 dwellings per hectare (depending on the area applied) is contrary to JP-H4 and NPPF policy L3.

NPPF Policy L3(4) states that "Development proposals that do not make efficient use of land in accordance with paragraph 2 of this policy should be refused".

NPPF Policy S4(2)(c) is clear that when considering whether the benefits of a development proposal would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, this would include situations where development proposals fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances. This would include Policy L3(4).

Conclusion - The proposal can be viewed as limited infilling within an established valley settlement. It would sit comfortably within the existing built-up area and would not extend development into open countryside, instead reflecting the character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy OL5/2 of

the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed development of 9 dwellings is not in accordance with the density requirements set out in Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Plan and Policy L3 - Achieving Appropriate Densities of the NPPF.

Given the absence of information in relation to land instability and contamination, it is not possible at this stage to determine whether or not the location of the application is suitable for the proposed residential use. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with paragraph 196 of the NPPF.

Given the absence of information in relation to ecology, including the impact upon protected species, woodland and ecological value, it is not possible at this stage to determine whether or not the location of the application is suitable for the proposed residential use. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policies EN6/3 and EN6/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy N2 - Improving the Natural Environment of the NPPF.

The application site is heavily treed, which contributes positively to the character of the town centre and the Conservation Area. The proposed development is likely to require significant tree removal, which would have a harmful impact upon the visual character of the town centre and conservation area, which would conflict with Policies EN2/1 and EN2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

It is noted that the proposed dwellings would be zero carbon. It is not possible to condition that the proposed dwellings would be zero carbon and as such, this would be assessed at the technical details stage.

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

Consultee responses

Strategic Planning & Infrastructure

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. This will need to be addressed at Technical Details stage.

Landscape character area

The site is within the River Irwell (north Bury) and Kirklees (LCA23), an area of Incised Urban Fringe Valleys 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.

Recreation

The site is identified in the UDP under Policy RT3/2 (specifically part of RT3/2/1 - Nuttall, Ramsbottom) as additional provision for recreation in the countryside. However, this has not been implemented.

Wildlife links

Policy EN6/4 states that wildlife corridors should be consolidated and where appropriate, strengthened. Furthermore, the policy states that development which would adversely affect wildlife corridors will not be permitted. Any new development within or adjacent to wildlife corridors should contribute to their effectiveness by way of design, landscaping and siting of the proposals, along with mitigation works.

Whilst detailed ecological information is not expected at the Permission in Principle stage, the absence of supporting surveys and assessment means there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the development could be delivered without harm to the wildlife corridor. In particular, the submission does not address potential impacts on habitat, connectivity, or lighting, nor does it indicate how the corridor could be maintained or enhanced through design or mitigation.

As such, there remains uncertainty as to whether the principle of development complies with Policy EN6/4. Based on the information currently available, the proposal is therefore considered to be in potential conflict with the policy. This information will be required at the technical details stage.

Biodiversity net gain

PfE policy JP-G8 requires development to follow the mitigation hierarchy of avoiding significant harm to biodiversity through consideration of alternative sites, then adequately mitigating and compensating for any remaining harm. It also requires development to avoid fragmenting or severing connectivity between habitats and to achieve a net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%. This reflects national statutory requirements.

This policy requires planning applications to be accompanied by a completed metric and written statement or draft Biodiversity Gain Plan. The policy also requires proposals to make appropriate provision for long-term management of habitats and geological features connected to the development. This information will be required at the technical details stage.

Traffic Section

The proposal would result in the creation of sub-standard access arrangements onto the Bury New Road with poor visibility at a hazardous location on the highway network in close proximity to other vehicular accesses, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and road safety.

Drainage Section

No objections, subject to the condition and informatives below:

CONDITION: Development shall not commence until details of surface water drainage proposals have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must be based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance and be designed in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or subsequent revisions of it. This must include assessment of potential SuDS options for surface water drainage with appropriate calculations and test results to support the chosen solution. Design details should comply with guidance contained in the Greater Manchester's Sustainable Drainage Design Guide, March 25. Details of proposed maintenance arrangements should also be provided.

REASON: To promote sustainable development. The current application contains insufficient information regarding the proposed drainage scheme to fully assess the impact.

The site is to be drained on a separate system of drainage with surface water and foul sewage being combined at the last manhole before connection to public sewer

Surface water discharge to be limited to existing flow from site less a minimum 40% reduction in run-off to allow for climate change to prevent surcharge of public sewerage system downstream of the proposed development Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework - Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change and Unitary Development Plan Policy EN5/1 - New Development and Flood Risk and its associated SPD 16 Design and Layout of New Development in Bury. Climate change allowance should be increased to 70% for sites which fall within Flood Zone 3

Application forms for permission to connect to the public sewer should be obtained by telephoning United Utilities PLC on 08456 020406 or online at www.unitedutilities.com

Applications for sewer requisitions should be obtained by telephoning United Utilities PLC at either Dawson House (01925 235871) or Hathersage Road (0161 609 7513)

The applicant should ensure that any proposed driveways/paved areas (in excess of 5m²) situated at the front of properties are constructed of permeable or porous materials. The applicant should refer to Dept. of Communities & Local Government publication "Guidance on the Permeable Surfacing of Front Gardens" for design & construction details.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land

Should this application be approved, 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. Given the site history, substantial site investigation works and assessment would be expected as a minimum.

Environmental Health - Air Quality

For this type of development, it would be expected that parking would be included. The site is not located within 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 500 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.

Conservation Officer

There is no objection to the proposed development in principle with regard to heritage impact and conservation.

The technical details application will need to address a number of issues affecting the setting of the conservation area regarding layout, mass, size, scale, design and materials in order to at least preserve its character and appearance

It is strongly recommended that, to at least preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, the proposed development should be a row of low rise two storey terraced dwellinghouses with parking and access to the rear and constructed from vernacular materials of local natural stone and natural slate roof covering with uniform fenestration.

GM Ecology Unit

We do not regard that permission in principle should be granted as there are potential ecological reasons to object and or could prevent the development being viable.

This is because the development falls within the Irwell Valley currently protected under UDP policy EN6/4 and falling within the Greater Manchester Nature Network. The GMEU will therefore likely object on these grounds unless strong evidence is provided to justify that mitigation can be provided.

Second the site is wooded and will have potential to provide habitat for protected species such as badger and there may be mature trees on the site capable of providing bat roosting habitat and the development is in close proximity to the River Irwell, where otter are known to be present. The risks are therefore high enough that accepting permission in principle could theoretically result in an illegal permission if protected species were subsequently found on the site as part of technical details that could not be resolved via a license.

"Current guidance states it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development is established before the planning permission is granted otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision (UK Government Guidance within the ODPM Government Circular 06/2005)"

Finally, the development is woodland likely of moderate ecological value but potentially of high ecological value, which will be replaced primarily with negligible and low value habitats. There is the potential for a significant net loss at the site level that would require the purchase of a significant off-site contribution that could make the development unviable.

We do not regard permission in principle being the correct type of application for this site, owing to the potential ecological constraints that could result in an objection from the GMEU. We therefore recommend the applicant withdraw and resubmit as either an outline or full application with as a minimum a preliminary ecological appraisal.

United Utilities

Should this proposal be approved, and an 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

Any queries that might result from the information contained within this letter should be addressed as follows:

- **From the Local Planning Authority.** Please email Planning.Liaison@uuplc.co.uk
- **From the Applicant.** Specific email contacts related to each category of work are located beneath each section header. Alternative ways to contact the team(s) are available in the Appendix, Section 6.0 'Contacts'.

DRAINAGE

Email: SewerAdoptions@uuplc.co.uk

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 comments made above.

In the event of us reviewing an application for Technical Detail Consent, it is likely we may request the following condition:

CONDITION

Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:

- i. An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water;
- ii. A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);
- iii. Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
- iv. Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable;
- v. Details of points of discharge for foul and surface water; and
- vi. Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems.

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

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.

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 review proximity or positioning of drainage proposals in relation to existing pipelines when assessing the suitability of a specific drainage design. 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

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. Additional information is available on our website: Working near our pipes - United Utilities

The applicant should also review United Utilities' 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines' document which can be found on our website:

standard-conditions-for-works-adjacent-to-pipelines-issued-july-2015.pdf.

They, or any subsequent developer working on the proposed site must adhere to the details contained within this document.

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.

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 for up to 9 dwellings on a 0.4ha site would not make optimal use of the potential of the site. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Policy L3 - Achieving Appropriate Densities of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in relation to land stability and contamination to assess whether the proposed development would be acceptable in principle. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy P2 - Ground Conditions of Chapter 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 The proposed development is likely to require significant tree removal on a site, which has significant tree cover and are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The removal of trees would have a harmful impact upon the visual character of the town centre and Ramsbottom Conservation Area. Therefore, the location of the proposed development would be unacceptable in principle and would conflict with Policies DP3 - Key Principles for Well-Designed Places and Policy HE9 - Conservation Areas of the National Planning Policy Framework and the following Policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
Policy EN2/1 - Townscape and Built Design
Policy EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas
- 4 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in relation to the impact upon protected species and high ecological value habitats to assess whether the proposed development would be acceptable in principle. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy N2 - Improving the Natural Environment of the National Planning Policy Framework and the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
Policy EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value
Policy EN6/4 - Wildlife Links and Corridors

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HL - 27/08/2026		DM 27/08/2026	