

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Charlotte Orrell	Date of report: 27/05/2026	Ref: 72825/FUL
Registration: 05/03/2026	LDfC: 15/04/2026	Expiry Date: 30/04/2026
Site Visit: 25/03/2026	Site Notice: 25/03/2026	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area:	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Conversion of existing dwelling to create 3 no. separate dwellings and erection of 1 no. dwelling

Location: Wood Mill, Wood Road Lane, Summerseat, Bury, BL9 5QA

Description

The application relates to a converted mill building, now in residential use on the south/south-eastern side of Wood Road Lane. The front boundary is open onto the driveway for the property, with hedges and trees bounding the party boundary with neighbouring properties. The eastern side boundary is formed by the River Irwell, with the western side boundary formed by hedging and fencing. The rear boundary is also formed by hedges and trees.

The proposal is to convert the existing dwelling into 3no. separate dwellings together with the erection of 1no. dwelling in the southern corner of the site. Dwellings A, B and C would be contained within the existing building, with Dwelling D being the new dwelling proposed.

Dwelling A would be a 4 bedroom property, located within the western side of the existing building. The dwelling would span across 2 floors, with the living areas proposed at the ground floor, and bedrooms and main bathroom situated at the first floor. The total floor space of the dwelling would be approximately 309sqm in size.

Dwelling B would be a 3 bedroom property, located within the southern end of the existing building. The dwelling would span across 3 floors, with a gym and swimming pool being located at basement level. The living areas would be situated at ground floor level, and the 3 bedrooms and main bathroom all would be on the first floor. The total floor space of the dwelling would be approximately 402sqm.

Dwelling C would be a 4 bedroom property, located within the northern end of the existing building. The dwelling would also span across 3 floors, with a games room, garage and back kitchen being located at basement level. At ground floor level, there would be one bedroom and the living areas of the property. The rest of the bedrooms and main bathroom would occupy the first floor. The total floor space of the dwelling would be approximately 411sqm.

To facilitate the conversion of the building, a first floor window is also proposed to be added onto the northern elevation of the building. This will serve one of the bedrooms proposed at Dwelling C.

To the western side elevation, the entrance door to Dwelling B is also proposed, with a small canopy a maximum of 3.5m in height and steps 0.6m in height are to be constructed to facilitate this. 2no ground floor windows, to serve the swimming pool and WC and 3no first floor windows, to serve one of the bedrooms, the landing and the bathroom are also proposed to be added.

At the eastern side elevation, an existing door is proposed to be blocked up at basement level. The side wall will also be built up in order to match the height of the existing parapet wall. This would amount to approximately 0.3m higher than the existing. 5no windows would be added to the ground floor of this side, 2no with Juliet balconies. The 5 windows would serve (from north - south), the kitchen and living room area of Dwelling C, the living room area of Dwelling B, the dining room area of Dwelling B and the swimming pool at Dwelling B. There would also be 6no. first floor windows added to serve (from north-south), the bedroom of Dwelling C, the en-suite of one of the bedrooms of Dwelling C, an enclosed terrace area of Dwelling B, a void area of Dwelling B and another enclosed terraced area for Bedroom 2 at Dwelling B.

To the southern side elevation, one ground floor window is proposed to serve the swimming pool area.

Dwelling D would be a 3 bedroom property, located at the southern end of the site, sandwiched between the existing outhouse forming part of the western boundary of the site, and the entrance to the neighbouring property to the south. At ground floor, there would be one bedroom and the living areas of the property, and at first floor would be a further two bedrooms. The existing outhouse will also be demolished, and a detached garage will be constructed to serve Dwelling D. Dwelling D would have a floor space of approximately 208sqm, with a garage size of approximately 42sqm. The maximum height of the dwelling would be 5.8m, with an eaves height of 3.2m.

There are 12 car parking spaces in total proposed at the site. The area is residential in nature, with some commercial uses such as farms.

The site is located within the Green Belt, and partially within Flood Zone 3.

Relevant Planning History

68719 - Lawful development certificate for proposed building for swimming pool and gym - Lawful Development 02/11/2022

69266 - Conversion of existing 1 no. dwelling into 4 no. separate dwellings - Approve with Conditions 04/07/2024

21/0225 - Building works and running transfer waste materials business from home address - 03/10/2022

23/0193 - Erection of outbuildings - 02/11/2023

24/0379 - Breach of pre commencement conditions of planning permission 69266 - 24/09/2024

Publicity

15 neighbours were consulted on 12/03/2026 and a site notice erected on 25/03/2026. 3 comments have been received detailing the following concerns:

Privacy Impacts

- Impact on privacy from proposed Juliet balconies

Environmental Impacts

- Concern over bonfires, and the issues they cause with smoke and ash
- The application lacks any Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) information or justification for exemption, despite recent vegetation loss and riverbank works.
- Concerns are raised about erosion of biodiversity and impacts on wildlife.

Drainage/Flooding Impacts

- Concern over existing sewerage and drainage system not being able to accommodate an additional dwelling
- Concerns regarding flood risk
- Long-standing inadequate surface water management on the shared access road has

resulted in water, mud and silt flowing onto the neighbouring property, causing nuisance and property impacts. These issues pre-date the current application and remain unresolved.

- The submitted surface water assessment is based on a previous application and does not account for the new dwelling, additional hardstanding, or existing drainage failures.
- Dwelling D would significantly exacerbate surface water problems, with no mitigation measures proposed.
- Concerns are also raised about unauthorised structures and a long wall adjacent to the River Irwell, within a flood-prone area, and whether Environment Agency consent has been obtained.

Access Impacts

- Repeated obstruction of the sole access to the neighbouring property during works, including the installation of an electric gate without consent, has interfered with established access rights.
- The increase in access points for proposed dwellings B and D will intensify the use of the access road, has worsened surface water issues, and led to damage and poor maintenance.
- There are concerns about the management of the access road during and after construction, particularly given previous disputes.
- The common access road has no capacity for parking or turning, and the proposals rely on vehicles manoeuvring within a constrained area that also serves the neighbouring property.
- Existing and potential gates, fencing and walls are considered to restrict visibility and manoeuvrability, with no conditions proposed to prevent further restriction through permitted development.
- Turning arrangements are inconsistent, potentially impractical, and fail to prevent vehicles from using the neighbouring property's driveway to turn.

Impact on Green Belt/Amenity of Area

- Dwelling D is a new residential development in the Green Belt on previously undeveloped land, which does not fall within any NPPF exceptions.
- The scale, siting and proximity of Dwelling D and its garage are considered harmful to safety, amenity and vehicle circulation.
- The proposal should be assessed as separate market dwellings, not as a communal arrangement, given the likelihood of future separate ownership.

Other Issues

- There are several instances of misleading or incomplete information, including the omission of underground fuel tanks, existing gates and fencing, unauthorised riverbank structures, inaccurate plans showing the extent of the access road, and failure to address BNG requirements.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - recommended refusal based on the application and submitted plans containing insufficient information in order to confirm whether adequate mitigation measures required to overcome the site's emergency access deficiencies from a fire safety perspective have been considered by the applicant in view of the site's remote location from the adopted highway network and excessive cul-de-sac length effectively involved.

Waste Management - no response received

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - recommended a condition and informative that would have been acknowledged subject to an approval

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - recommended the same conditions as implemented under application 69266 which would be acknowledged subject to an approval

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - recommended the submission of a Preliminary Roost Assessment and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prior to determination

Environment Agency - did not object to the proposed, but recommended a condition around contaminated land and a remediation strategy that, subject to an approval, would have been acknowledged.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - there is a large water main with an easement crossing the red line boundary to the north of the site; however, this is located away from the area where the proposed dwellings are shown and does not, in itself, raise concern at this stage.

Noting that this is a full application, UU would usually expect full drainage details to be submitted upfront. In the absence of these details, UU requested a planning condition to be imposed which, subject to an approval, would have been acknowledged.

Planning Policy Manager - recommended refusal based upon inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Planning & Building Regs consultation Fire Protection Dept Bury Fire Station (Part B)/G M FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE - did not provide comments however, subject to an approval, a sprinkler system within each dwelling would be acknowledged within the conditions as is usual within rural locations to provide safety for current and future occupiers.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

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
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN8/2	Woodland and Tree Planting
OL1/4	Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
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-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

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.

Green Belt

National Green Belt policy is contained within section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 goes on to state that very special circumstances will not

exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 lists a number of buildings/development which may be considered acceptable in the Green Belt.

Policy JP-G9 establishes the extent of the Green Belt within the borough.

Whether the conversion is deemed appropriate within the Green Belt

UDP Policy OL1/4 - Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate development and would be permitted provided that:

- it would not have a materially greater impact than the present use on openness;
- any extensions of re-used buildings and any associated uses of land surrounding the building do not conflict with the openness of the green belt;
- the buildings would be capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction; form, bulk and design would be in keeping with the surroundings;
- suitable access and traffic can be accommodated;
- necessary services can be provided;
- no damage to habitats or protected species.

The proposed conversion would mean that the existing building is converted into 3 dwellings. The only extensions or alterations proposed are modest, and are not considered to impact the openness of the Green Belt further. The building is constructed from stone with a mix of pitched roof constructed from slate and a flat roof and is of permanent construction. The issues of bulk, design and access will be addressed later in the report.

Therefore, the proposed conversion of the building into 3 dwellings would be acceptable and would be in accordance with Policy OL1/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the NPPF.

Whether the new proposed dwelling (Dwelling D) is deemed appropriate within the Green Belt

Policy OL1/2 of the UDP states that the construction of new buildings inside the Green Belt is inappropriate development, unless it is for one or more of the following purposes:

- agriculture and forestry (except where permitted development rights have been withdrawn);
- essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it;
- limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings, provided that this would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, or, in the case of replacement of existing dwellings, the new dwelling is not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- limited infilling in existing villages as set out under Policy OL1/3. (Policy OL1/3 of the

UDP states that in all named villages which lie within the Green Belt, limited infill development may be permitted, provided that it is in scale with the village and would not adversely affect its character or surroundings.)

Within the documents submitted as part of this application, it states that the previous consents of the site are relevant to the consideration of this proposal as they provide fall back positions and demonstrate how the site can be developed. This includes the previous application (69266) to convert the existing building into 4no dwellings, as well as a Lawful Development Certificate for a Class E outbuilding at the site in which Dwelling D is proposed. The previous Lawful Development Certificate argues that this section of land, which is to form the proposed site for Dwelling D, is considered residential curtilage of Wood Mill despite it being located across the common access road.

The submitted information also argues that the proposed site is previously developed land, as it is garden curtilage and as demonstrated within case law, garden curtilage within rural areas is considered to be previously developed land.

The submitted information further goes on to state that:

Given the potential dimensions of the Class E building and significant height of the summerhouse outbuilding, the proposal has been developed to now seek a modest new build dwelling that has a lower ridge height than the existing summerhouse, and be smaller in volume terms than the Class E building and summerhouse combined. The summerhouse will be demolished, which will improve the western boundary to the residential dwellings off Wood Road Lane, with the resultant new property effectively replacing an existing built structure away from those properties and at a reduced height.

The existing summerhouse at the property is two storey in height and forms part of the western boundary of the site. Although the submitted information states that Dwelling D is proposed to seek a modest dwelling a lower ridge height than the summerhouse, the two would not be compared as the existing summerhouse is tucked along the western boundary with boundaries formed by existing residential neighbours and Dwelling D is proposed at the site within the south-western area of the curtilage, with the boundaries mostly being formed by green belt land.

The proposed Dwelling D would be sited at the area where the Class E building was proposed, however the Class E building, if built, would be single storey at 4m in height and a maximum width and length of 7.5m x 13.35m. The proposed Dwelling D would be 5.5m in height, 7.7m x 13.4m in width/length. Despite the proposed Dwelling having the same floor area dimensions, it would be 1.5m higher in height and therefore would appear materially larger, and cause more of an impact than if the Class E building was built.

Furthermore, although the submitted information states that the combined volume would be smaller than proposed Dwelling D, the volume would be concentrated within a previously open site, with views into Green Belt land and so this would also cause an impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The submitted information also states that Paragraphs 154 d and g of the NPPF should be taken into account, as the proposal meets these exceptions. These state that developments may be appropriate within the Green Belt where:

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

The argument that the proposal complies with Paragraph 154 d is not accepted given that the replacement building, as argued above, would appear materially larger and is not within the same use. The existing summerhouse is not currently used as a dwelling, it is used as storage for materials at the site, as well as being in need of refurbishment.

The argument that the proposal complies with Paragraph 154 g is also not accepted as, although it may be argued that the land is residential curtilage and therefore previously developed, it would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt. As argued above, it would introduce a 5.5m high building within a previously open area of land, giving unobstructed views into the Green Belt and therefore this would not be considered acceptable.

The submitted information also argues that if the above arguments are not accepted, the Housing Delivery Test result should be taken into account. Whilst this can provide a 'tilted balance' in favour of development, it is not a Very Special Circumstance that can provide a reason for the development of the Green Belt.

The submitted information also argues that the area can be considered Grey Belt Land. This argument is also not accepted however, as the location is not sustainably linked, and as argued above, the proposed Dwelling D would also undermine the purposes of the Green Belt, in particular the openness and would lead to a sprawl of development, which Green Belt policy is aiming to prevent.

Given the above, it is therefore considered that the proposed Dwelling D does not comply with Green Belt policy as does not fall within any of the exceptions, and would harm the openness which underpins Green Belt policy. No relevant very special circumstances have also been submitted and therefore the application will be refused on this account.

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:

- where the area is designated as Green Belt the established Green Belt policies will apply;

As discussed above, the proposed would not comply with Green Belt policy, and therefore it would also not be considered acceptable in terms of Policy OL5/2.

Design

The proposed conversion involves the conversion of the existing dwelling and associated building into 3 dwellings. The proposed development would utilise the existing openings within the building, with the exception of the blocking up of one door on the Eastern elevation. There would also be additional windows and a door added to the elevations, as well as the raising of the Eastern side wall slightly to meet the existing height of the parapet. The materials proposed are also to remain consistent to the existing dwelling. Given these are modest amendments and additions, the character of the building would be retained and the proposed amendments would be unobtrusive. It is also noted a potential

future balcony is proposed on the plans. As there is no information on this, and it is noted as a future proposal, this has not been assessed and any balcony addition at the property would require a separate planning application.

In terms of the proposed Dwelling D, the dwelling has been designed to be a maximum of 5.5m in height, with dormers proposed to the front, and habitable rooms within the roof space. The materials proposed are a mix of natural stone and render with feature stone cills and heads. Grey concrete tiles or slate will be used for the roofs. Given the mixed use of materials and property types in the area, the proposed dwelling would be unlikely to cause further impacts and therefore would be considered acceptable.

Therefore, the proposed conversion and development would not be a prominent feature in the streetscene and would be in accordance with Policies OL1/4, H2/1, H2/2 and EN1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

Layout

Policy JP-H3 states that all new dwellings must:

- comply with the nationally prescribed space standards; and
- be built to the 'accessible and adaptable' standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The agent has provided a report which confirms that all of the proposed dwellings would comply with the nationally prescribed space standards with regard to the overall floorspace and the size of bedrooms. The report confirms that the dwellings would be built to the accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations and this would be secured by a condition should the application be recommended for approval.

Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy JP-H3 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Policy JP-H4 states that new housing development should be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport to achieve efficient use of land and high quality design. The minimum density for this site is 35 dwellings per hectare.

The application site is located within the Green Belt and is subject to national Green Belt planning policy set out through the NPPF. The proposed developments would increase the density to 3.5 dwellings per hectare, which would be below the required 35. The location of the site is within the Green Belt where a higher density is often not considered appropriate. The proposal however is to convert one house into 3 separate dwellings alongside the erection of a dwelling at the site, with the argument within the submitted information that it would be compliant with Green Belt Policy as falls within the exemptions. If the proposal was to be considered compliant with the Green Belt policy exemptions, housing density should have been taken into account and has not been and therefore it is likely that it would fall short in regards to the requirements of Policy JP-H3 due to the density falling way below the 35 dwellings per hectare required.

Impact upon surrounding area

All of the proposed dwellings would have a side or rear garden and the level of private

amenity space would be acceptable. There would be space within the gardens for bin storage and this is identified on the proposed site plan.

The boundary treatment would consist of hedgerows and timber fencing. The details of which would be secured by a condition should the application be recommended for approval.

Therefore, the proposed developments would not be a prominent feature in the streetscene and would be in accordance with Policies EN1/2, H2/1 and H2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

Impact upon residential area

SPD 6 provides guidance on aspect standards for residential properties and would be relevant in this case.

There would be 41 metres between the rear elevation of the proposed conversion and approximately 33m between the proposed Dwelling D and the blank gable of West Bank, which would be in excess of the 20 metre aspect standard.

There would be 14 metres from the eastern elevation of the conversion to the boundary, which is the River Irwell, which would be in excess of the 10 metre aspect standard.

There would be a minimum of 7m from the rear elevation of Dwelling D to the rear boundary. Despite this being less than the 7m minimum required within SPD6, this is not a directly facing residential boundary and therefore is acceptable in this instance.

There would be over 30 metres from the proposed conversion to No. 13 Wood Road Lane and over 50 metres from the front elevation of the proposed development to the rear of the properties, which front onto Wood Road Lane. Both of these would be in excess of the 20 metre aspect standard.

There would be over 20m from proposed Dwelling D to properties along Wood Road Lane, and over 40m to the rear elevations of these neighbours, in excess of the 20m aspect standard.

Therefore, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policies H2/1, H2/2 and EN1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

Tree and Woodland

Policy JP-G7 of the PfE plan states that where development would result in the loss of existing trees, requiring replacement on the basis of two new trees for each tree lost, or other measures that would result in a net enhancement in the character and quality of the treescape and biodiversity in the local area, with a preference for on site provision.

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.

The agent has confirmed that there would be no trees or hedges removed as part of the proposal and as such, this is considered acceptable.

Ecology/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.

The submitted information states the proposed would be self-build and therefore exempt from BNG requirements. Self and custom build requirements, as noted with the BNG guidance, states that you must meet all of the following conditions to qualify for an exemption as a self-build or custom build:

The development must:

- consist of no more than 9 dwellings
- be on a site that has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares
- consist exclusively of dwellings that are self-build or custom housebuilding as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015

The site has an area larger than 0.5 hectares, therefore cannot be considered self-build and for this reason, it is considered that insufficient information has been received in regard to BNG requirements.

GMEU were also consulted who made the following comment:

The Design and Access Statement states that parts of the house need to be refurbished and parts are to be remodelled. This could have an impact on the roof and any loft spaces present which could impact roosting bats if they are present (and nesting birds). Therefore, we would expect at least a bat Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) to be undertaken and provided for a proposal of this nature to identify whether the buildings hold any bat roosting potential and to determine whether further surveys or mitigation measures are required. Bats are a material consideration in the planning process and therefore this is required prior to determination of the application. It is also recommended that a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) is carried out on the whole site to identify impacts to any other protected species and nearby designated sites (if applicable), that the proposal may have.

The site is directly adjacent to the River Irwell and therefore we would expect a CEMP to be provided to detail pollution prevention measures and to protect this habitat throughout the works, if permission is granted.

The PEA and PRA would be required prior to determination and as these were not submitted with the application, it is considered insufficient information has been submitted in order to assess the application based on Policies JP-G8 of PfE, EN6/3 of the UDP and Paragraph 180 of the NPPF.

Flood risk/drainage

The application site is partly located within flood zones 2 and 3 and the River Irwell forms the boundary to the east. The topography of the land rises from the River Irwell. Firstly, it rises steeply to the river embankment wall and then a grassed embankment rises gradually to the west, where the existing dwelling is located. The levels are:

- water level is 94.62 metres AOD,
- the top of the embankment wall is 97.50 metres AOD,
- the ground at the base of the property wall, which relates to the basement on the

eastern elevation is 97.75 metres AOD; and

- the top of the embankment, which equates to the ground floor of the property is 99.53 metres AOD.

The rooms in the basement of the existing building would be a games room/workshop, garage and swimming pool and as such, would not be habitable. The ground floor and first floor would be at 99.5 metres AOD, which would be above the 1+100 year flood level of 99.36 metres AOD. As such, the habitable room windows for the proposed dwellings would be above the maximum flood level.

The Environment Agency was also consulted who raised no objections but did recommend a condition to be imposed, which would have been acknowledged subject to the application being approved.

Therefore, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon flood risk on the site and would not increase the flood risk downstream. The proposed development would be in accordance with Policy JP-S4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the NPPF.

Highways Issues

The Council's Highways Engineer was consulted who made the below comment:

The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in order to confirm whether adequate mitigation measures required to overcome the site's emergency access deficiencies from a fire safety perspective have been considered by the applicant in view of the site's remote location from the adopted highway network and excessive cul-de-sac length effectively involved.

Therefore, the proposed development would be detrimental to highway safety and would not be in accordance with Policies H2/1, H2/2 and EN1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-C5 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Parking

SPD11 states that the maximum parking standards for dwellings are:

- 1 spaces for a 1 bed dwelling;
- 2 spaces for a 2-3 bed dwelling;
- 3 spaces for a 4 bed dwelling and greater.

This would equate to 12 spaces.

The proposed development would provide 10 spaces and 2 visitor spaces, alongside 2 car parking spaces within the garage for Dwelling D. The parking provision would therefore be in accordance with SPD 11.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development represents inappropriate development within the Green

DELEGATED REPORT

Belt as is not considered to fall within any of the exemptions outlined within Paragraph 154 of the NPPF. It is not considered that any very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the substantial harm caused to the purposes and openness of the Green Belt and is therefore contrary to Policy OL1 of the UDP and Green Belt Policy outlined within the NPPF, as well as River Valleys Policy OL5/2 of the UDP.

- 2 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain Requirements to enable them to be properly assessed against Policy JP-G8 of PfE and Paragraph 180 of the NPPF.
- 3 The application contains insufficient information in regards to no Preliminary Ecological Appraisal or Preliminary Roost Assessment to enable the application to be properly assessed against Policy JP-G8 of PfE, UDP EN6/3 or Paragraph 180 of the NPPF.
- 4 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in order to confirm whether adequate mitigation measures required to overcome the site's emergency access deficiencies from a fire safety perspective have been considered by the applicant in view of the site's remote location from the adopted highway network and excessive cul-de-sac length effectively involved, contrary to Policy JP-C5 of PfE.

<u>Case Officer</u> CO 27.05.2026	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u> DM 27.05.2026	<u>Date</u>
--------------------------------------	-------------	--	-------------