

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 11/03/2026	Ref: 72695/FUL
Registration: 16/01/2026	LDFC: 12/02/2026	Expiry Date: 13/03/2026
Site Visit: 28/01/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 3	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Demolition of former Ramsbottom Ambulance Station and erection of 3 no. dwellings with associated parking, private gardens and landscaping

Location: Former Ambulance Station, Cemetery Road, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9PU

Description

The application relates to the former Ambulance Station on Cemetery Road. The existing site is occupied by a single storey, flat roof building. The site is accessed from Cemetery Road. Terraced properties are located to the north west of the site fronting Cemetery Road and Hazel Street. Semi-detached, and shorter rows of terraced residential properties are located to the front and the rear of the site. The Cemetery is located to the south east of the site and includes the former Cemetery Lodge which is now a detached residential property.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the former Ramsbottom Ambulance Station and the erection of 3 no. detached dwellings. The dwellings would be 2 storey dwellings, with accommodation also provided within the roof space. Parking is proposed to the fronts of the properties, with gardens located to the rear.

Relevant Planning History

03119/E - Demolition of former ambulance station and construction of 3 no. detached 5 bed dwellings (stone facade and slate roof to match local dwellings with landscaping to front & rear) - Enquiry Complete

Publicity

Letters sent to neighbouring properties 21/01/2026

3 objections received in relation to:

- Cemetery Road is a single-access road with only one entry/exit, limiting capacity.
- Existing congestion from on-street parking, with vehicles often parked on both sides.
- Vehicles regularly park illegally on double yellow lines due to lack of parking space.
- Visibility at the junction with Bolton Road West is already poor and unsafe.
- Additional traffic from three new dwellings would worsen existing congestion.
- The road is too narrow to safely accommodate demolition and construction vehicles.
- Large vehicles already block the road daily; construction vehicles would be worse.
- Refuse wagons and gritting vehicles already struggle to access the street.
- Only four properties have off-road parking; the rest rely on street parking.
- New off-street parking for the proposed dwellings would remove existing informal parking spaces.
- Parking demand already exceeds capacity and will increase further.
- The road surface has recurring potholes that reappear after temporary repairs.
- Potholes are worsening, especially in the centre of the road.
- Heavy construction traffic would create further deterioration and damage.
- Concern about tyre damage and a need to report potholes to the council.

DELEGATED REPORT

- Single-access road increases risks if blocked.
- Current congestion already delays emergency vehicles.
- Residents include elderly individuals, children, and persons with serious medical conditions.
- Any worsening of congestion presents an unacceptable risk to emergency response.
- Nearby high school and primary school increase pedestrian traffic.
- Children frequently cross Cemetery Road to access the park.
- Community centre used by elderly residents increases vulnerability.
- Increased traffic raises safety concerns.
- No clear Construction Management Plan in the application.
- No explanation of how large vehicles will turn, load, unload or avoid blocking the street.
- Anticipated noise, dust, and air pollution during works.
- Development considered an overdevelopment relative to local infrastructure capacity.
- Increased noise, congestion, and disturbance for existing residents.
- Proposed houses effectively 3-storey and out of character with local single and two-storey properties.
- Height will obscure views from neighbouring properties.
- Upper floors will allow overlooking into neighbouring homes, reducing privacy.
- Concern about trees with TPOs on site.
- Fear of accidental damage during construction leading to subsequent removal.
- Request for strict enforcement of protections.
- Development sits directly next to the cemetery entrance.
- Additional traffic would interact with sensitive funeral and visitor movements.
- Request for planning committee members to visit the site to understand constraints.

3 comments received in relation to:

- Fears that removal would affect neighbouring property foundations.
- Residents request updates on any works and clarity about future maintenance responsibilities for the TPO tree.
- Concern that creating flat gardens may require removal of the bank supporting a neighbouring wall.
- Unclear what would support that wall if the ground level is altered.
- Queries about the height and location of boundary fencing (1.8m) given level differences.
- Light/shadow assessment only carried out for one property.
- Request for universal bird bricks (BS 42021) to support red listed species such as swifts and house sparrows.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommendation for refusal due to substandard access arrangements leading to loss of on street parking and insufficient information in relation to highways works.

Waste Management - No response

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - The submitted Drainage Strategy Statement identifies a reduction in impermeable area and outlines the proposed drainage hierarchy. However, the information provided is currently insufficient to fully assess the potential impacts of the proposed surface water drainage arrangements.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - The main considerations for this application are bats, nesting bird and biodiversity net gain. All can be covered by either informative or condition text.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Whilst a Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment was submitted, it was found to be insufficient. Conditions requested in relation to the submission of a site characterisation and risk assessment, remediation strategy and verification, unexpected contamination and imported soil.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - 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.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN8/1	Tree Preservation Orders
EN8/2	Woodland and Tree Planting
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
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
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S5	Clean Air
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 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 (Residential)

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 is an assessment of potential sites for residential development and is used to assess the housing land supply. It includes sites that have an extant planning permission, sites allocated through the joint Places for Everyone Plan 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 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 statement, the Council has demonstrated a 4.3 year supply of housing land. This includes a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) and accounts for past oversupply when assessed against the adopted PFE housing requirement. The Council is therefore currently unable to demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing land against the adopted housing requirement.

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%.

The five year supply position and the housing delivery test result need to be treated as material factors when determining applications for residential development.

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.

This means that as a result of the lack of five year supply and the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' set out in NPPF paragraph 11(d) applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

The site is located within an established urban area, outside of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

Design and Layout

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. Therefore in accordance with Policy JP-H4 regard should be had to a minimum net residential density of 35 dwellings per hectare at this site. The application form states the site is 950 square metres or 0.095 hectares. Based on 3no. properties this would lead to a density of 31.6 dwellings per hectare which would not make efficient use of land.

Policy JP-H4 states that lower densities may be acceptable 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 submitted Density Statement states that approximately 100 metres of the site is root protection zone associated with retained trees and as such the developable area is approximately 0.085 hectares which would lead to a density of 35.3 dwellings per hectare. The Density Statement does not include an image of the developable area however arboricultural assessments have been submitted as part of the application that can be reviewed.

The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment shows the Root Protection Areas (RPA) of the trees within the site, and within the Cemetery. It should be noted that the applicant seeks to remove trees T9 and T7 within the site and the trees within the Cemetery appear to be excluded from the RPAs within the site due to root barriers (walls, hard landscaping etc). It would appear therefore that the RPA to be taken into consideration for this particular layout relates to the Oak Tree (T8) at the front of the site. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment highlights that the total RPA of T8 is 157 square metres however not all of this RPA is within the site. The Assessment sets out that 37m² of the RPA would be impacted by the proposed structure and 23.5m² of the RPA would be impacted by the driveway. This totals 60m². This would lead to a developable area of 890 square metres or 0.0890 hectares which would actually lead to a density of 33 dwellings per hectare which would not meet the minimum requirements for the site.

Notwithstanding the need to take RPA's into consideration it is considered that the density of 35 dwellings per hectare can easily be accommodated within the site, should the proposed dwellings be reduced in size to more closely reflect the density and grain of the housing within the vicinity of the site to make more efficient use of the land to be developed. This will be expanded on further below.

It should also be noted that Bury Housing Needs and Demand Assessment 2024/2025 has identified a pressing demand for family housing (e.g. 3-bed houses) at the present time. As such it can be argued that the size of the properties, at 5no. beds does not meet an identified need. As such it is considered that the applicant has failed to justify a lower density at the site to meet the policy tests set out above.

UDP Policies H2/1 and H2/2 provide the assessment criteria for detailed matters relating to height, appearance, density and character, aspects and finishing materials for new residential developments. Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that development proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of a particular area. PfE Policy JP-P1 seeks to create a city region that consists of a series of beautiful, healthy and varied places. High quality design is fundamental to achieving this. PfE Policy JP-H3 seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes reflecting local plan policies and having regard to relevant local evidence. Development across the plan area should seek to incorporate a range of dwelling types and sizes, including for self-build.

The immediate streetscene is depicted by a mix of single and two storey, terraced and semi-detached properties. Ramsbottom Cemetery Lodge is located to the south east of the site and is a detached property with stone detailing and a ground floor projecting bay window. Whilst mixed in design, there is an established local context, grain and vernacular.

The proposed dwellings are all detached in style, with flat roof projecting bay windows and projecting gables. Accommodation is proposed within the roof space, with gable picture windows also located on the front elevations. The proposed dwellings would be sited approximately 8.4 metres behind the front elevation of the terraces to the north west of the site with a 12 metre long, 5.5 metre wide driveways and areas of soft landscaping to the front.

It was confirmed at pre-application stage that it was considered that the front elevation of the proposed dwellings needed to be simplified to replicate the streetscene in which they would be sited and that the proposed density on the site needed to be increased. The applicant was advised to review whether a row of terraced properties with less bedrooms

would better suit the streetscene and constraints of the site. The applicant considers however that the dwellings are an appropriate and good quality design response having regard to the very mixed house types, styles and materials in the immediate context. The applicant has also referenced The Bramble Place development to the rear of the site which includes a three storey apartment block and is a newer development approved in 2013 in their examples of differing house types within the vicinity of the site. The dwellings identified by the applicant however, are all dwellings with smaller footprints or are higher density developments and whilst varied in style and materials all reflect a relatively simple aesthetic which is the design approach that the applicant was encouraged to consider at pre-application stage.

It was also confirmed at pre-application stage that a vertical emphasis needed to be provided through the openings to the fronts of the dwellings. This guidance was intended to ensure that the dwellings reflected the existing terrace to the north west of the site as this would primary streetscene that would be impacted by the proposal. It was acknowledged at pre-application that there is a more ornate dwelling at Ramsbottom Cemetery Lodge however this property is the exception within the immediate street scene and inspiration should really be taken from the terraced properties that define the character of the locality. Indeed as set out above the applicant's own planning statement, newer build properties (Bramble Place) within the vicinity of the site that have responded positively to this approach in design terms.

The proposed dwellings would have a much larger footprint than the neighbouring terraced and semi-detached properties, and would not replicate the grain of development that is readily visible within the context of the site. For clarity the footprints of the dwellings (measured from the applicant's site layout) would be approximately 110 square metres. When measured from this drawing the neighbouring terrace at No. 29 has an existing footprint of approximately 43 square metres, the bungalow to the rear has a footprint of approximately 73 square metres. The proposed level of hardstanding to the fronts of the dwellings is also considered to be excessive, leading to a car dominant proposal. Due to the design of the dwellings, with accommodation proposed within the roof space it is also considered that the dwellings appear top heavy when viewed in relation to the neighbouring properties particularly the row of terraced dwellings. Streetscene elevation drawing 006 Rev D in particular highlights this as the eaves heights of the terraced dwellings would not reflect the eaves height of the proposed properties. The dwellings would therefore be out of scale when viewed within the context of the site.

It is considered that the proposal would lead to a development that would, by reason of its size, scale, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework , H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, JP-P1 - Sustainable Places and JP-H4 - Density of New Housing and the National Planning Policy Framework.

PfE Policy JP-H3 also states that all new dwelling must:

1. Comply with the nationally described space standards (NDSS); and
2. Be built to the 'accessible and adaptable' standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The proposed dwellings would all be considered to be 3 storey, 5 bedroom, 8 person properties. Contrary to the Nationally Described Space Standards Compliance Statement submitted by the applicant which states the properties need to have a Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 156 square metres, NDSS actually requires a minimum of Gross Internal Area of 134 square metres for this size of property. Based on the floor plans the GIA for each property would be 240 square metres which would exceed the minimum requirements.

The master bedroom, bedroom 2 and bedroom 3 would exceed minimum areas and widths for double occupancy rooms. Bedrooms 4 and 5 would exceed minimum areas and widths for single occupancy rooms.

Storage proposed would exceed the 3.5 square metres required by NDSS.

M4(2) compliance can be secured by condition.

In support of the above section in relation to density, it should be noted that the GIA for the proposed dwellings are 100m² over the minimum requirements. Indeed the applicants own NDSS compliance statement confirms that "each proposed dwelling provides a Gross Internal Area substantially in excess of the NDSS minimum requirement for a five-bedroom, three-storey dwelling." This would indicate that the house types proposed are too large and that a higher density can be accommodated at this site.

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. 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.

For clarity the following aspect standards would be applicable:

- 20 metres between directly facing habitable room windows;
- 13 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed two storey blank wall
- 6.5 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed single storey blank wall
- 7 metres between a proposed first floor habitable room window and a directly facing boundary with a neighbouring property.

The sections submitted show that the levels within the site rise towards the rear boundary. As such the bungalows to the rear of the site would be approximately 1.8 metres higher than the ground floors of the proposed dwellings. As this is not a full storey in difference additional distances have not be applied to the aspects set out above.

The proposed first floor rear windows would be located approximately 10.9 metres from the directly facing rear boundary exceeding the 7 metres required. The proposed windows of plot 2 would face towards the blank side gable of No. 49 Hazel Street. The proposed ground floor element would be located approximately 11.4 metres from this blank gable exceeding the 6.5 metres required by SPD 6. The proposed first floor would be located approximately 13.5 metres from this gable again exceeding the requirements of SPD 6.

A distance of 30 metres can be provided between the proposed front windows and the directly facing dwellings on Cemetery Road. This would exceed the requirements of the aspect standards set out above for the proposed ground, first floor and loft windows.

The proposed dwellings would not project beyond the principal front elevation of the terraced properties to the north west of the site.

No. 29 Cemetery Road has a single storey rear extension. This has not been shown on the proposed site layout submitted by the applicant. The rear elevation of the extension appears to be blank. It is therefore considered that the proposed dwelling would not have a detrimental impact on the ground floor windows of this property. Plot 1 would extend beyond the first floor of No. 29 by approximately 14.2 metres and would intercept a 45 degree line as taken from the midpoint of the nearest habitable room window. The

applicant has submitted a daylight and shadow assessment in support of the application that looks at the impact of the proposal on the rear windows of this property that confirms that shadows from Plot 1 would be expected to fall primarily to the west in the morning, north at midday, and east in the afternoon. The period of greatest potential effect on No. 29 would therefore be during early morning hours. Given the location of the proposed dwelling, in relation to the path of the sun it is unlikely that this relationship would have a detrimental impact on this window to warrant refusal of the scheme on this point.

Highways, Access and Parking

Policy EN1/2 requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access, parking and service provision. This is further supported by Policy H2/2 that requires proposals to demonstrate adequate car parking provision, access for both vehicles and pedestrians, and provision for public transport and the existence of any public rights of way. Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 require streets to be well designed and managed to make a significant positive contribution to the quality of place and support high levels of walking, cycling and public transport.

The Traffic Section have confirmed that whilst the principle of the development should not present a problem in highway terms due to the previous, much more intensive use, the proposed access and parking arrangements would result in the loss of on-street parking facilities.

Each dwelling would have a driveway that measures approximately 5.5 metres in width and 12.18 metres in length. The objections to the application raise concerns that parking on street is already at capacity. Site visits by the Case Officer at pre-application and application stage confirm that parking does take place along both sides of the road, abutting the double yellow lines at the junction with Bolton Road West to accommodate the parking needs of the existing residents as there are very few properties on Cemetery Road with off street parking. Vehicles do presently park on street to the front of the site and Street view images from August 2025 also show that the frontage of the site is utilised for parking.

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.

Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the setting of local parking standards for both residential and non-residential developments to take account of:

- The accessibility of the development
- The type, mix and use of the development
- The availability and opportunities for public transport
- Local car ownership levels
- The need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles

The site is located within Zone 4 as set out within SPD 11. SPD 11 requires 3 spaces per dwelling for dwellings of the size proposed. The proposal shows 3no. cars parked on each of the driveways however there is clearly adequate space to park a fourth car to the front of the property. This parking, that exceeds policy requirements therefore leads to wider driveways which reduces the amount of available on street parking.

The additional parking over and above the requirements of SPD 11 would therefore reduce the frontage that can be utilised for on street parking from approximately 17.5 metres to 10.8 metres. This would reduce the amount of available parking for existing residents to utilise to their detriment.

The applicant has submitted an amended site plan that shows a reduction in

driveways/width of the access proposed however this has not been accepted as the LPA would not seek to negotiate small amendments that will not affect the overall in principle decision.

It is therefore considered that the parking proposed as part of the scheme would exceed the requirements for dwellings of this size leading to proposed access arrangements that would result in the loss of most on-street parking on the easterly side of Cemetery Road abutting the site boundary.. This would lead to a reduction in the of street parking that is currently available for existing residents to utilise. It is considered that this is likely to lead to overspill parking elsewhere and carrying out manoeuvres on the adjacent adopted highway, to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development, Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-C5 - Streets for All, JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling, JP-P1 - Sustainable Places, Supplementary Planning Document 11: Parking Standards in Bury and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Storage for 5no. cycles is shown to the rear of the site complying with the requirements of SPD 11.

The Traffic Section have also requested a refusal based on insufficient information in relation to the following:

- Physical impact of the development on the existing adopted highway abutting the site, including all associated highway and highway drainage remedial/accommodation works required to reinstate the redundant vehicular access to adjacent footway levels, extent and form of the proposed access alterations and required footway crossings, demarcation of the limits of the adopted highway and works to tie the extension of the northerly Cemetery Road footway into the pedestrian access and gate to Ramsbottom Cemetery.
- Impact on lighting levels in the vicinity of the site and adequacy of the proposed street lighting column replacement/relocation works proposed.
- Proposed driveway dimensions, gradients and materials.
- Finished floor levels for the proposed dwellings.
- Measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the adjacent adopted highway.
- Adequate levels of visibility at the both the junctions with Cemetery Road and at the back edge of the footway in accordance with the standards in Manual for Streets.
- Adequacy of the proposed in-curtilage bin storage arrangements at each dwelling to ensure that the requirements of Waste Management's 'Guide to Refuse Collection Requirements & Storage Methods for New Developments' are met and the adopted highway is not used for the storage of bins.

Having reviewed the proposed site plan this does include dimensions for the proposed driveways, spot points through the site and bin storage. The proposed sections also include finished floor levels. It is considered the other elements listed above may be able to be dealt with a detailed highways condition and as such this has not been included as a reason for refusal.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

PfE Policy JP-G8 states that through local planning and associated activities a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought. This is supported by Policy EN6/3 that seeks to retain, protect and enhance the natural environment and seeks to retain features of ecological or wildlife value. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. UDP Policy EN8/2 supports and encourages new woodland and tree planting within the borough.

The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) although it is unclear if this has been undertaken by an Ecologist as the Author is listed as "Ecological Consultant."

Bats

A Preliminary Roost Assessment and ground level tree assessment (Gritstone Ecology - October 2025) has been submitted. A full internal and external inspection of the property and trees found negligible potential for the building and trees to support roosting bats. GMEU have no reason to question the finding of the report. The Local Records Centre holds few records of foraging or roosting bats in the area. Having assessed the work planned, there is negligible potential for the works to disturb roosting bats and no further surveys are required.

Whilst the works have been assessed as having negligible risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat and the signs of bats is found all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s). Natural England should also be informed. GMEU would suggest an informative to this effect be placed on any permission.

Nesting Birds

The two trees to be felled and the shrubs may support nesting birds. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Should the tree and shrub removal be delayed until after the 1st of March, GMEU would recommend the following condition be added to restrict felling to outside of nesting bird season.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The information submitted with the application includes a basic Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) report and statutory Biodiversity Metric from Natalie Morris (Nee Woollacott) MCIEEM (August 2025)

The appraisal found the site had some ecological value, consisting of individual trees, shrubs and modified grassland

GMEU have examined the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) metric spreadsheet and agree with the calculations provided.

After construction of the development, onsite biodiversity remediation and the 10% net gain requirement there is due to be a deficit of 0.39 Area Habitat units.

Given the availability of offsite units, this appears to be a realistic achievement for the site and therefore the LPA can be reasonably confident that the statutory biodiversity requirements could be discharged.

GMEU would not consider the onsite biodiversity mitigation/enhancement to be significant and a habitat management and monitoring plan is not required.

If approved, the Biodiversity Gain Plan (BGP) and updated metric should be completed to show how the onsite/offsite biodiversity gain will be achieved and approved by the LPA, before the automatically applied statutory biodiversity gain condition can be released.

Biodiversity Enhancement

GMEU would also expect any such scheme to include measures to enhance biodiversity at the site in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. We would recommend that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement be incorporated into the new development. These should include:

- Bat bricks and/or tubes within the new development
- Bird box/swift nesting bricks
- Hedgehog friendly fencing

GMEU suggest a condition to this effect be placed on any permission.

Trees

UDP Policies EN8/1 and EN8/2 seek to support the retention of trees, woods, copses and hedgerows to encourage natural regeneration and new and replacement tree planting. PfE Policy JP-G7 seeks to significantly increase tree cover, protect and enhance woodland, and connect people to the trees and woodland around them.

T9 (maple) is proposed to be removed as part of the application. This tree is subject to a provision Tree Preservation Order and is set to go to Planning Control Committee for confirmation on the 24th March 2026. This is after the determination date of the application.

The applicant considers that the retention of tree T9 would materially constrain the developable area of the site and compromise the ability to deliver a scheme of appropriate density, layout and viability. As confirmed above the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment shows the Root Protection Areas (RPA) of the trees within the site. The RPA for T8 (retained) impacted by the development would be approximately 60 square metres. Should T9 be retained the RPA within the site (measured approximately from drawing 2524_TCP.02) would be approximately 45 square metres. This would reduce the developable area of the site to 0.0845 hectares. The retained developable area would therefore allow a density of 35.5 dwellings per hectare if 3 dwellings, of a different style are proposed meeting JP-H4 Policy requirements. In terms of the existing scheme this would require a slight reduction in the footprint/removal of the projecting single storey element of unit 1. T9 is located on the boundary of the site, not centrally and layouts can be amended to accommodate retention of the tree and this was highlighted at pre-application phase.

The applicant has also highlighted within their Planning Statement that T9 has been categorised in the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment as a Category B tree, reflecting its moderate quality and amenity value, rather than a tree of high or exceptional importance. The tree has actually been given an A category in relation to condition with a B2 Retention Category, the B relating to moderate quality and the 2 relating landscape value. The 2 indicates that the tree has landscape value, often as part of a group or for its screening/amenity function. This is the same category of tree as the Oak tree to the front of the site that the applicant seeks to retain. Given that both trees are given the same value in relation to landscape value and quality it is unclear why T9 should be removed other than to facilitate the development which can be reasonably amended to accommodate the tree.

The applicant considers that the tree is located towards the rear of the site, in close proximity to adjoining residential properties, and while partially visible from public vantage points, does not form a prominent or defining feature of the streetscene. The applicant also considered that the trees visual influence within the public realm is therefore relatively limited. This would conflict with the assessment within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Council would contend that the tree is very prominent within the street scene as it is located at the head of the cul-de-sac on Hazel Street/Bramble Place and is visible from within the cemetery, the public access path to the north of the ambulance station and from Cemetery Road. The tree clearly makes a contribution to the visual amenities of the area, not only as a single tree but also in connection with the protected oak tree (TPO 368) to the front of the site, the trees within the Cemetery (some of which are also protected TPO 336), and the TPO trees within the Bramble Place development to the rear of the site (also TPO 336).

The applicant also considers that the proposal includes a comprehensive landscaping strategy which will deliver new tree planting across the site, including along the principal

street frontage where visual amenity benefits will be more meaningful and publicly perceptible. No landscaping plan or strategy has been submitted with the application. Proposed site plan (004 Rev G) and proposed site layout plan (009 Rev B) each show 2no. small trees to the fronts of plots 2 and 3 with no indication of species. The Biodiversity Net Gain Design Stage Report indicates 3no. additional trees within the rear gardens of Plot 1, 2 and 3 again with no indication of species. The proposed lighting plan (011 Rev A) shows 5no. field maples. The tree to be removed is a category A condition tree, that is approximately 12 metres in height. Replacement with 5no. trees of 3 - 3.5 metres in height would not be adequate mitigation for the loss of a healthy tree that the Council consider's worthy of a TPO. It is therefore considered that insufficient information in relation to mitigation for the loss of this tree has been submitted.

The proposed development by virtue of its size and siting would result in the loss of an existing tree which is subject of provisional Tree Preservation Order - 367. The damage to or loss of this tree is considered to be unacceptable because of the impact on the general amenity and character of the area in which the application site is located and appropriate mitigation has not been identified. The development is therefore contrary to the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework: EN8/1 - Tree preservation Orders, EN8/2 - Woodland and Tree Planting and JP-G7 - Trees and Woodland.

Drainage

PfE Policy JP-S4 and UDP Policies EN7/3 and EN7/5 seek to protect the water courses and other water features within the Borough, and limit surface water pollution.

The submitted Drainage Strategy Statement identifies a reduction in impermeable area and outlines the proposed drainage hierarchy. However, the information provided is currently insufficient to fully assess the potential impacts of the proposed surface water drainage arrangements.

Further clarification and additional information are therefore required in relation to the following:

- Proposed discharge rate
- Confirmation of the intended surface water discharge rate (l/s), with evidence that it will not exceed the existing runoff regime, taking account of climate change allowances, in accordance with current national policy and guidance.
- Hydraulic calculations
- Detailed calculations of peak runoff rates for the 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change events, demonstrating that the proposals will not increase flood risk or cause surcharge of the receiving public sewer network.
- Exceedance flow routing
- Details of exceedance flow routing to demonstrate safe conveyance of flows away from buildings and other vulnerable areas.
- Drainage layout and maintenance
- A drainage layout plan may be required to support the assessment of the proposed arrangements. Once confirmed, details of maintenance responsibilities and procedures, including for any pipework, should also be provided.

Given the scale of the proposal, it is considered that these details could be provided by condition.

Contaminated Land

Paragraphs 187 and 196 of the NPPF seek to ensure that sites are suitable for its proposed use taking into account ground conditions, any risks arising from land instability and contamination.

The site currently comprises a ambulance station. A Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study Report has been submitted and reviewed by the Environment Section as to whether it fully

provides a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA). The Environment Section noted that it appears to be predominantly Artificial intelligence (AI) derive and therefore recommend that should the application be approved a detailed preliminary risk assessment, which includes interpretation of the data and a clear, well developed conceptual site model, must be undertaken. This can be provided by condition.

Carbon And Energy

JP-S2 - Carbon & Energy sets out the steps required to achieve net zero carbon emissions.

At pre-application stage it was confirmed that a statement will need to be provided to show how the proposal complies with this policy. It was also confirmed that any inclusion of heat pumps, PVs etc need to be shown on site plans and elevations and specifications should be detailed.

A statement has been provided, that includes the provision of air source heat pumps, and photovoltaic panels for all dwellings to meet the requirement of this Policy. The air source heat pumps are not shown on the proposed site plan or site layout and the proposed elevations do not include any indication of the location of these carbon reduction interventions.

In terms of Air Source Heat Pumps the main consideration in relation to this installation will be in relation to the noise created. As such UDP Policy EN7/2 is required to be considered for this application. This policy states that the Council will not permit development which could lead to an unacceptable noise nuisance to nearby occupiers and/or amenity users or development close to a permanent source of noise. The installation of an air source heat pumps on domestic premises is considered to be permitted development, not needing an application for planning permission, provided limits and conditions are met however permitted development rights would not apply until the property is built and occupied. No details have been submitted in relation to the location or the specification of the air source heat pump proposed and therefore it is considered that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed heat pump would not impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties by virtue of noise.

In addition lack of information in relation to the elevations means that an assessment in terms of the visual impact of these interventions can also not be made.

The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate that the proposed air source heat pump and photovoltaic panels would not be seriously detrimental to the residential and visual amenities of nearby occupiers, by reason of noise and disturbance. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Bury Unitary Development Plan and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Policies EN7/2 - Noise Pollution, JP-P1 Sustainable Places, EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design and H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development.

Digital Connectivity

JP-C2 - Digital Connectivity - this policy requires development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting.

The applicant has confirmed that each dwelling would be designed to enable connection to high-speed fixed broadband services. Ducting and internal cabling routes will be provided during construction to facilitate future connection to fibre-to-the-premises (FTTP) or equivalent high-speed broadband services, subject to availability complying with the above policy.

Other Matters

It is acknowledged that the applicant did seek to front load the application process through submission of a pre-application enquiry, and has sought to address comments made by the LPA (Local Planning Authority) through their planning statement however the scheme has

not significantly altered since pre-application advice was given.

The applicant's agent was made aware of the LPA's fundamental concerns with the application prior to determination of the scheme. The LPA however did not invite amended plans to be submitted as it was considered that the scope of the changes required to the scheme would alter it beyond what had originally been submitted for consideration.

Government guidance is clear that it is at the discretion of the LPA whether to accept changes or additional information to submitted applications. The LPA also has discretion to determine if the changes need to be re-consulted on, or if the proposed changes are so significant as to materially alter the proposal such that a new application should be submitted.

The Applicant has submitted amended plans in relation to the parking and access layout to the front however these have not been accepted as the LPA would not seek to negotiate small amendments that will not affect the overall in principle decision, which the amended plans do not. Additional sections, and clarification on ecology information however was accepted as these made up part of the validation requirements for the scheme that were set out at pre-application stage.

Response to Representations

The proposal would see the re-development of the former ambulance station that occupied the site. Highways consider that the proposed end use would be less intensive than the former use in terms of traffic generation. The access to the site in terms of the road network has not been altered since the ambulance station was in operation. Given the scale of the proposal a construction traffic management plan would not be required at application stage and can be provided by condition.

Loss of view and problems arising from the construction period (noise, dust etc) are non-material planning considerations that are not relevant to the decision.

An assessment has been made in relation to the design of the proposed dwellings, loss of on street parking, impact on TPO trees and overlooking within the main body of the report.

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 1no dwelling on the site of circa 0.12 hectares would not make optimal use of the potential of the site. Therefore, the proposed development would not make efficient use of land conflicting with Policy JP-H4 - Density of New Housing of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 2 It is considered that the proposal would lead to a development that would, by reason of its size, scale, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of

the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework , H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, JP-P1 - Sustainable Places and JP-H4 - Density of New Housing and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The proposed development by virtue of its size and siting would result in the loss of an existing tree which is subject of provisional Tree Preservation Order - 367. The damage to or loss of this tree is considered to be unacceptable because of the impact on the general amenity and character of the area in which the application site is located and appropriate mitigation has not been clearly identified. The development is therefore contrary to the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework: EN8/1 - Tree preservation Orders, EN8/2 - Woodland and Tree Planting and JP-G7 - Trees and Woodland.
- 4 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed air source heat pump and photovoltaic panels would not be seriously detrimental to the residential and visual amenities of nearby occupiers, by reason of noise and disturbance. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Bury Unitary Development Plan and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Policies EN7/2 - Noise Pollution, JP-P1 Sustainable Places, EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design and H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development.
- 5 The parking proposed as part of the scheme would exceed the requirements for dwellings of this size leading to proposed access arrangements that would result in the loss of most on-street parking on the easterly side of Cemetery Road abutting the site boundary.. This would lead to a reduction in the of street parking that is currently available for existing residents to utilise. It is considered that this is likely to lead to overspill parking elsewhere and carrying out manoeuvres on the adjacent adopted highway, to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development, Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-C5 - Streets for All, JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling, JP-P1 - Sustainable Places, Supplementary Planning Document 11: Parking Standards in Bury and the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP 11/03/2026		DM 12.03.2023	