

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 12/11/2025	Ref: 72457/PIP
Registration: 14/10/2025	LDfC: 07/11/2025	Expiry Date: 18/11/2025
Site Visit: 21/10/2025	Site Notice: 21/10/2025	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 4	Con Area:	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for up to 9 no. dwellings

Location: Land off Whalley Road, Ramsbottom

Description

The site comprises 0.93 ha which is designated in the Green Belt and a Landscape Character Area and the site is largely open land apart from a former industrial unit and associated parking and servicing which is located along the Whalley Road frontage. The site is level where it fronts Whalley Road and steadily rises towards the eastern boundary.

To the north of the site are residential dwellings, one of which is a listed building and an industrial unit and Fletcher Bank Quarry lies to the east.

To the south are residential and commercial units and Whalley Road forms the western boundary where there area mix of uses.

The applicant has identified there are a number of constraints to developing the site including creating an access, the topographical character of the site and the allowance for on-site BNG.

The application seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up to 9 dwellings.

A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing - led development.

The PiP consent has two stages. The first stage, the Permission in Principle establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second stage is the Technical Details Consent when detailed development proposals are assessed.

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 detail or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP.

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

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 informative notes to advise the applicant of the requirements at a technical details stage.

Conditions cannot be attached to a PiP.

Relevant Planning History

n/a

Publicity

Letters sent to 32 properties on 17/10/25

Site notice posted 21/10/25

Additional information submitted to support the application - Supporting Statement, Land Availability Assessment, Density and Character Analysis and Sustainability Statement.

Amended letters sent to neighbours on 27/10/25

4 objections received -

- The site lies within protected Green Belt land, and building nine dwellings here would cause permanent loss of open countryside and set a dangerous precedent for future development.
- The area provides valuable natural habitats for wildlife, which would be destroyed by this scheme.
- Traffic on Whalley Road and through Shuttleworth is already at breaking point, and extra vehicles will worsen congestion and safety risks.
- Local infrastructure roads, schools, healthcare, and drainage has not been upgraded despite continual new housing in the area.
- Further development without improvements is unsustainable and harmful to both the environment and community.
- What will happen to the part of the warehouse that is not being removed... will that be built on later?
- Parking is difficult for local residents and affects local businesses too. Visitors struggle to park at times and that is before any further dwellings are built.
- 9 houses is far too many for this site.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Objects

Waste Management - No response received

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No objections subject to condition

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objection in principle

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objection in principle

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objection subject to details provided at Technical matters stage

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment

JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

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 up to 9 no. dwellings.

Consideration of PiP applications are limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

Consultations on the planning application can be carried out but conditions cannot be attached to a PiP approval.

The issues to establish acceptance of the proposed PiP development are analysed below.

Green Belt

The application site falls within the Green Belt as designated by PfE Policy JP-G9 and as a result any development on the site is subject to NPPF Paragraph 154 and 155.

Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF is clear that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless one of the listed exceptions apply. The proposed development does not meet any exceptions listed within paragraph 154.

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

- a) The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b) There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- c) The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF; and
- d) Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

Grey belt is defined by the NPPF as "land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development."

The application site does not impact assets referred to in footnote 7 and as considered above, a small fraction of the site comprises previously developed land. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to the following purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

Planning guidance published on 27th February 2025 for assessing a site against these purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision

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

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

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

The site is currently free of existing development and lacks physical features that would contain and restrict development to the east, though to the west is the A56 and existing residential development. The site is not adjacent to a large built-up area though is enclosed to the north and south by existing development.

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

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighboring towns merging

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

Grey belt conclusion

As the site does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes (a) or (b), the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt land. However, for the proposal to be considered as not inappropriate development it must satisfy all of the criterion, a to c, listed in NPPF paragraph 155.

Criterion A Considering the impact on the remaining Green Belt in the plan area

This criterion requires that the development would not fundamentally undermine, the purposes, when taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Following reference to the guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 64-008-20250225), it is considered that whilst the development site would represent an irreversible encroachment into the countryside, the site is relatively small in comparison to the remaining Green Belt and overall the development of the site in principle would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Criterion B Demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

This criterion requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need, which in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, means:

- A lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or
- Where the Housing Delivery Test is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

Five-year supply

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant under-delivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing

land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

- 246 homes per year from 2022-2025;
- 452 homes per year from 2025-2030; then
- 520 homes per year from 2030-2039.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the deliverable land supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed. The joint Places for Everyone Plan allocates significant strategic sites for housing within Bury and will accelerate housing delivery within the Borough to meet housing needs.

Based on the 2024 5-year supply statement, the Council has demonstrated a deliverable 5-year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

Housing Delivery Test

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

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

Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

In this case, the site is located within the Green Belt so therefore paragraph 11 (d)(i) applies, and the proposal needs to be assessed against Green Belt policies. The latest published HDT result for Bury also means that NPPF paragraph 155(b) is triggered, and there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed

Criterion C Sustainable location

NPPF paragraph 155(c) requires consideration of whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework

Paragraph 110 states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support the sustainable transport objectives in paragraph 109. Development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 115 states that development should ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised and safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

In this regard, PfE Policy JP-C1: An Integrated Network sets relevant advice, supporting:

- Patterns of development that minimises both the need to travel and the distance travelled by unsustainable modes to jobs, housing and other key services, including healthcare, education, retail, recreation and leisure facilities, green space and green infrastructure; and
- Locating and designing development, to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport;

There are frequent bus services on the A56 to Bury and Rawtenstall and the site is located approximately 1km from the closest town centre at Ramsbottom (supermarkets, pharmacies, GP, schools and post office), equating to a 15-minute walk. As such, it is considered that the site is in a location which lends itself to a range of active and sustainable transport modes and is within a reasonable distance from key services that users of the proposed development may wish to access. Therefore, the proposal meets criterion C.

Green Belt conclusion

The site falls within the definition of Grey Belt land and meets all the required criteria a-c of NPPF paragraph 155.

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

Housing

Type, Size and Design of New Housing

PfE Policy JP-H3 - Seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes. All new dwellings must 1. comply with the nationally described space standards and 2. be built to the 'accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. The accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations would need to be secured by condition.

Custom and Self Build

The applicant states that it is proposed that all dwellings are self-build properties. In order for this to be given weight in the decision-making process, this should be specified in the description of development to ensure that it is delivered as such at technical details stage.

Density

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. The site falls in an area where a minimum density of 50 dwellings per hectare applies, because it is less than 800 metres from Ramsbottom Town Centre. The total site area is circa 0.93 hectares, therefore 9 dwellings equates to 9.7 dwellings per hectare. The proposal would therefore fall significantly short of the PfE density standards set out in policy JP-H4.

The applicant states that the developable area will be significantly smaller, but cannot determine the exact extent of the developable area at this stage. In order for the development to achieve 50 dwellings per hectare, the developable area would be 0.18 hectares for a 9 dwelling scheme. This would require circa 80% of the site to be undevelopable. Whilst it is accepted that on-site provision of BNG would reduce the developable area (although the extent of the reduction is unknown), and there are topographical constraints, the loss of circa 80% of the site seems unlikely.

The policy 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 site's Green Belt location would not automatically justify a lower density.

The applicant states that self-build housing cannot be delivered at a higher density than that being proposed. This is incorrect, as custom and self build housing covers a diverse range of development types and delivery models, can be delivered at higher density, and is not restricted to large detached homes.

Parts of the frontage of Whalley Road in close proximity to the site and areas to the north around Richard Street are characterised by terraced dwellings at high density. Development at higher density would not be out of character with the local area.

Developing the site for up to 9 dwellings at less than 10 dwellings per hectare (based on gross site area) would therefore be contrary to JP-H4 and NPPF paragraph 130 which expects development to make efficient use of land.

Landscape Character Area

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

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

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

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

Biodiversity

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 would be a requirement at technical details stage.

Consultee responses and considerations of a Technical Details stage

Highways

The Highway Section have raised an objection to the proposal with the following as the reason for refusal -

The proposal would result in the creation of sub-standard access arrangements onto the A56 Whalley Road at a hazardous location on the highway network in close proximity to the Greenacre Close junction, bus stop and lay-by to the north of the site and junctions/accesses on the westerly side of Whalley Road, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and road safety on a high speed Class 1 road.

The proposal would result in the loss of existing access, parking and servicing arrangements/facilities for 'The Warehouse' industrial unit that is to be retained, which is highly likely to lead to vehicles parking and carrying out manoeuvres on the adjacent Class 1 road (A56 Whalley Road) at a hazardous location on the highway network, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety.

The Highways concerns have been noted. However, access is not a consideration in the PiP process. .

Ecology - GMEU response

GMEU are not aware of any significant ecological issues associated with this site that would lead to a reason for refusal of the development.

The main ecological issue is likely to be biodiversity net gain, with 10% net gain likely to require purchase of off-site units. Badger may be present in the locality, other protected species are likely to be absent.

As part of technical details GMEU would recommend

- A preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA),
- An additional species surveys recommended by the PEA,
- A biodiversity net gain assessment and a statutory metric

Heritage

There are two heritage assets to the north of the application site; a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) - 2 Higher Fold Lane, opposite Higher Fold Farm, Ramsbottom and the Grade II listed building (LB) - Higher Fold Cottage, Ramsbottom.

Whilst there would be no objection in principle, from a heritage conservation stand point to the proposed development a subsequent application for the approval of technical details will require an assessment of the significance and the setting of the both the LB and the NDHA with regard to understanding any contribution made by their setting to the significance of the assets, and how any impact of the proposal would affect that significance.

Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy (NPPF) states that 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 assets 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.

Other relevant policies would be:

Adopted UDP policy EN2/3 - Listed Buildings

Greater Manchester Combined Authority Joint Plan - JP-P2 Environment.

Paragraphs 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216 of the NPPF.

Environmental Health response

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

Contaminated Land

Historic mapping indicates that the site may not have had any previous development, however, a sensitive end use is proposed. As such, to avoid pre-commencement conditions sufficient information must be submitted at Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, to demonstrate that no remedial measures are required or to agree such measures. Further information regarding Land Contamination and the planning process can be found in Bury Council's Developers Guide and on the Planning Portal.

Air Quality

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.

United Utilities

Should this proposal be approved, and a further application submitted for Technical Detail Consent, it is important to note that our response to a subsequent application will be based upon the information that is available at the time of response, and therefore, our position and advice may vary.

LLFA - Drainage Engineer

Would recommend a condition as follows -

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

Informatives

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

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.

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 No dwellings on a 0.93ha 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 Chapter 11, particularly paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT 12/11/25			

