

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 30/04/2025	Ref: 70922/FUL
Registration: 05/03/2025	LDFC: 27/03/2025	Expiry Date: 30/04/2025
Site Visit: 12/03/2025	Site Notice: 11/03/2025	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 21	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 6 no. detached dwellings with associated access and landscaping

Location: 70 Ringley Road West, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1DN

Description

The application relates to a plot of land off Ringley Road West, which contains a single detached dwelling, which was converted from a chapel. The existing dwelling would be located centrally with gardens to the front side and rear. There is a vehicular access off Ringley Road West on the western side of the site.

There are residential properties to the north, east and west and there are open fields to the south.

The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of 6 dwellings. Four dwellings would be three storey detached dwellings and two apartments would be located in a single three storey building.

All of the proposed units would be approximately 6 metres wide and would have a eaves height of 5 metres and a ridge height of 9.1 metres.

The dwellings would be accessed from a new access on the eastern side of the site and would lead to an access road that all the parking spaces would be accessed from.

The red edge for the application site has been amended since the application was validated and has excluded land

Relevant Planning History

02924/E - Demolition of existing building and erection of 4 no. detached dwellings with associated access and landscaping at 70 Ringley Road West, Radcliffe. Enquiry completed - 15 January 2024.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 20 August 2024 and 6 March 2025 and site notices were posted on 14 September 2024 and 11 March 2025..

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

- The dwellings are not in keeping with the surrounding properties, which are all 2 storeys.
- The proposed dwellings will tower above the existing properties.
- The nearby houses will be completely overlooked and will suffer a severe loss of privacy.
- There would be an increase in traffic on the road, which would be a safety hazard.
- A major concern would be that there could easily be up to 12 vehicles parked at the

front of the development before any visitors are taken into account. Will visitors then park on the main road? This would be another safety hazard

- It seems that the preliminary risk assessment is based on FOUR houses on the site and the same is true of the ecological report. This creates the impression of a cut-and-paste tick-box exercise.
- The development of three storey houses on such a small plot is out of character with the neighbourhood. It threatens to create noise, congestion and unsafe pavements during construction and to threaten the privacy and established amenity of residents on completion
- The period of construction will bring noise nuisance and the possibility of spread of dust and INNSs.
- The density of residential development will be dramatically increased in a small area.
- What is the impact upon the bats that fly around the area?
- The property you wish to destroy has history for the area. The new homes will destroy the look of the area especially the type of homes you want to build
- The houses at the top of Outwood Road are an eyesore and do not fit in with the area
- There is a lot of wildlife in the area, which will be impacted.
- Potential noise pollution.
- Potential negative impact on property value in area.
- What plans are in place for parking? Ringley Road West is a very busy road.
- One big concern is where will the contractors and their vehicles park?
- Five properties on the site will be too dense. The site is higher than Oakley Close so three storeys will be overbearing to existing homes.
- An additional entrance onto the narrow main road will be detrimental to road safety and to wildlife. It is not uncommon to see crashed vehicles in the opposite hedge and injured deer without this additional traffic/hazard. The extra entrance and vehicles will also be a risk to pedestrians.
- The style of the houses is not in keeping with the street scene and rural setting
- The overall style, in particular the full length windows is not in keeping with the style of existing homes. In short, this development looks like an apartment block with a car park to the front. So out of place.
- More concerning, is the impact to traffic caused by residents entering/leaving the entrance (which is in a different position depending on the plan). Visibility is poor. Where do their visitors park? The main road is already busy and narrow - a risk to pedestrians, car passengers and surrounding nature.
- 5 houses squeezed onto this small site is too many, 3 stories too high to fit with the neighbouring properties.
- Personally as a dog walker myself when I have to take the dog along that stretch of Ringley Road I am fearful for mine and my dogs safety, as the pavement is so narrow and the cars, lorries and big vehicles speed up there,
- Object to the proposed development relating to matters of density, scale, layout, height, form and car parking.
- The proposed thin elongated housetypes with little breathable gaps between the dwellings create a squashed and intense streetscene on Ringley Road West and a dominant and intense pattern of development blocks that fails to respond to the surrounding context and built form.
- The design of the dwellings in terms of height, scale and form are not respectful of the site context and character and the street scene of the local area. The applicant provides no assessment as to how this conclusion has been reached. The extracts below demonstrate that the design and appearance of the proposed housetypes take no cues from any of the existing site context and would create an alien development along Ringley Rod West completely out of character with the surrounding area.
- The proposed roof type is alien to the surrounding roofscape of neighbouring dwellings. The justification provided by the application that the rooms within the roofspace integrate the scheme into its wider context is a fantasy. The proposed dwellings are 3 storeys in height. There are no three storey dwellings within the immediate locality and the significant massing of the proposed dwellings creates an overbearing and dominant relationship to adjacent properties

- The imposing three storey height of the proposed dwelling, the level change between the site and adjacent properties, the prominent roof pitch, the large expanse of glazing and the obtrusive balconies combine to not 'integrate' the scheme into its surroundings but significantly harms the residential amenity, privacy and wellbeing of properties on Oakley Close.
- The position, proximity, height and appearance of the proposed dwellings create an unacceptable standard of living conditions for existing residents and be visually harmful to existing neighbour amenity.
- The existing dwellings are lower and the proposed dwellings are three storeys in height, which would have an unacceptable impact on the existing properties.
- The house type B only has 1 space and a garage - this does not comply with the parking standard of 3 spaces.
- Most garages are used for storage, which would leave 1 space available for a 4 bed dwelling. Where would the others park.
- There is no provision for visitor parking and no bin collection point has been provided.
- The access on the landscaping plan is different from the other plans.
- Reducing the number of proposed dwellings would provide further opportunities for landscaping and biodiversity enhancements and reduce the significant net loss in biodiversity on the site.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommend refusal - lack of information - proposed access, car parking, bin storage, impact on adjacent highway, surface water drainage.

Drainage Section - No objections, subject to the inclusion of condition relating to attenuation tank and infiltration.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objections, subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to contaminated land.

Environmental Health - Air Quality - No objections, subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to electric vehicle charging.

Waste Management - Bin would need to be stored near the kerb and the vehicles would not be able to manoeuvre within the site.

United Utilities - No objections, subject to inclusion of condition relating to foul and surface water drainage

GM Ecology Unit - The BNG metric should be updated following changes to the scheme. No objections, subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to nesting birds, protected species, invasive species, landscaping, including bat and bird boxes and an informative relating to bats.

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
H2/6	Garden and Backland Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/7	Throughroutes and Gateways
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H2	Affordability of New Housing
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing

JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
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
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) should be treated as a material planning consideration and it emphasises the need for local planning authorities to boost the supply of housing to meet local housing targets in both the short and long term. The Framework states that unless they have an adopted plan that is less than five years old that identified a five year supply of specific deliverable sites at the time of conclusion of the examination, then local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific developable sites to provide either a minimum of five years' worth of housing, or a minimum of four years' worth of housing in certain circumstances set out in NPPF paragraph 226.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

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

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

Following the adoption of Places for Everyone, the Council is now able to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

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

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

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, taken as a whole.

In terms of housing delivery the Borough has under delivered against the local housing need, and as a result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

The site is considered to be in a sustainable location for housing within the urban area and sitting outside the Green Belt. The national requirement to significantly boost the supply of

housing under the NPPF is a material consideration that would favour the residential development of this site in principle. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy H1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Design and layout

Design - Policy H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development requires all new residential development to make a positive contribution to the form and quality of the surrounding area. Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development seeks to ensure that new residential development will be acceptable in terms of layout in order to provide a good quality residential environment. In addition to this, Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design seeks to ensure that any proposals would not have an adverse impact on the particular character and townscape of an area.

The design of any new dwelling within the context of this street scene needs to be carefully considered, especially when reviewing the most recent updates to the NPPF with its focus on design and the National Design Guide. The NPPF makes it clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental with Paragraph 126 stating "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."

This is further supported by the National Design Guide. The National Design Guide, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in 2019 states that well designed new development is influenced by "an appreciation and understanding of vernacular.....including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents." In terms of layout the Design Guide states that a well designed place is unlikely to be achieved by focusing just on appearance, materials and detailing of buildings and that layout, including the grain pattern of development, blocks and lots needs to be considered and relate to one another to create spaces, open spaces and buildings.

The proposed dwellings would be constructed from red brick with grey cladding and a grey tile. There are a variety of materials in the locality including red and beige brick dwelling with tudor detailing. Given the variety of materials, including some existing dwelling in red brick, the proposed materials would not be a prominent feature in the streetscene.

The proposed development would be two storeys with living accommodation in the roofspace, whereas the surrounding dwellings to the north, east and west are all two stores in height. The proposed dwellings would incorporate an eaves height of 5.1 metres and a ridge height of 9.1 metres. A streetscene plan has been provided, which shows the relationship between the existing and proposed dwellings. The proposed dwellings would be considerably taller than the existing dwellings and would not match the eaves or ridge height of the existing dwellings. As such, the proposed dormers and living accommodation in the roofspace exacerbates the size of the roof and the scale, massing and bulk of the proposed development would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policies EN1/2, H2/1 and H2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Density - PfE Policy JP-H4 requires new housing development to be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land and high-quality design. Policy JP-H4 sets out minimum densities that should be considered. 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 site covers an area of 0.1657 hectares. The plans have been amended to change 1 dwelling to 2 apartments, which would result in the provision of 6 dwellings. This would

equate to a density of 36 dwellings per hectare, which would exceed the minimum density of 35. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Space standards - 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.

House types A and B would be a 4 bed, 8 person, 3 storey dwelling. The proposal would have a GIA of 179 and 191 square metres respectively, which would exceed minimum standards. Each of the proposed bedrooms would exceed the minimum floor areas, and widths for double occupancy rooms.

House type C would include a 1 bed, 2 person single storey dwelling and a 3 bed, 6 person two storey dwelling. The proposal would have a GIA of 53 and 108 square metres respectively, which would exceed minimum standards. Each of the proposed bedrooms would exceed the minimum floor areas, and widths for double occupancy rooms.

The proposal would therefore comply with NDSS and M4(2) compliance would be secured by a condition. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy JP-H3 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Impact upon surrounding area - The proposed dwellings would have a garden at the rear, which would provide a suitable level of private amenity space. There would be space at the side of the proposed dwellings for bin storage, which would be obscured by the proposed gate. No information on the proposed boundary treatments has been provided and the proposed landscaping plan has not been updated following the amendments. As such, there is insufficient information in relation to assess the impact upon the appearance of the area.

In addition, the Waste Management Section has confirmed that the refuse vehicle would not be able to manoeuvre within the site and a separate collection point should be provided. The proposed site plan indicates that this would be on the pavement, which forms part of the adopted highway. On collection day, there may be up to 12 bins on the pavement, which would have an adverse impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policies EN1/2, H2/1 and H2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

Impact upon residential amenity

SPD6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and would be relevant in this case.

There would be 10 metres between the rear of house types A and C and the boundary of the garden, which would comply with the aspect standard of 10 metres.

There would be 9.1 metres between the rear of house type B and the boundary of the rear garden, which would not comply with the aspect standard of 10 metres.

There would be over 24 metres between the rear of the proposed dwellings and the rear of Nos 5 and 7 Oakley Close. This would exceed the aspect standard of 23 metres.

There would be 14.7 metres between the rear of house type C and the blank gable of No. 3 Oakley Close, which would exceed the aspect standard of 13 metres.

House type C would extend over 7 metres beyond the rear elevation of No. 1 Oakley Close, which contains a number of habitable room windows. The proposed dwelling would

contravene the 45 degree line from the rear elevation and as such, would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of this property.

Therefore, the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the future occupiers of house type B and the amenity of the occupiers of No. 1 Oakley Close and would conflict with Policies EN1/2 and H2/1 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

Ecology - The main ecological issues relate to bats, other protected species, nesting birds, other wildlife, invasive species and biodiversity net gain.

Bats - The building to be demolished was assessed for bats and subject to two dusk surveys. No evidence of bats roosting was identified, with only low levels of common pipistrelle bat activity recorded. There are no reasons to doubt the findings of the report. GM Ecology Unit has no objections, subject to the inclusion of an informative relating to bats.

Other Protected Species - There is no evidence of any other protected species. Whilst ponds are present within 250 metres, the consultant concluded based on the distance intervening habitats and scale of the development that even if Great Crested Newts (GCN) were present the risk of an offence would be very unlikely. GM Ecology Unit agrees with the findings and are aware that these ponds have been surveyed in the past with no evidence of GCN being present. Whilst these surveys would not be regarded as valid they add weight to the consultant's conclusion. No further information or measures are required.

Nesting Birds - Whilst some tree and shrub clearance has already occurred, further tree removal and removal of the front hedge would be proposed, potential bird nesting habitat. No evidence of birds nesting in the building was reported. GM Ecology Unit has no objections, subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to nesting birds.

Other Wildlife - Habitats on site were assessed as suitable to provide cover for species such as hedgehog and that there was a risk of such species coming to harm during the construction. This is considered to be reasonable and the measures identified in section 7.23 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal relating to reasonable avoidance measures would be sufficient to mitigate the risk of harm. GM Ecology Unit has no objections, subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to the reasonable avoidance measures.

Invasive Species - A number of invasive species were identified on the site including Giant Hogweed and two species of Cotoneaster. GM Ecology Unit has no objections, subject to the inclusion of condition relating to invasive species.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - Section 180 of the NPPF 2023 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The development will result in a net loss of garden to built development. Some tree removal had occurred prior to the ecological survey but based on google earth within the last year or two. Adverse effects on wildlife appear restricted to loss of bird nesting habitat. Soft landscaping is proposed.

The proposed development would not be exempt from mandatory BNG as more than 25 square metres of area-based habitat would be lost and more than 5 metres of hedge appears would be removed along the frontage.

A biodiversity assessment has been provided that indicates a 1.46BU shortfall in achieving 10% BNG. This includes correctly the already felled trees and taken the precautionary

approach that they were in good condition. A BNG metric was provided and GM Ecology Unit assessed it. However, the metric needed to be re-run as the revised plans excluded various areas of land from the red edge. An updated metric has not been provided and as such, there is insufficient information to assess whether the proposed development would comply with 10% net gain. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policies EN6 and EN6/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Highways issues - The proposed development would involve the closure of the existing access and the provision of a new access towards the east of the site. The location of the access is different on the proposed site plan and the proposed landscaping plan and as such, it is not clear where the proposed access would be located.

The required visibility splays have not been plotted on the detailed site plan and the land the visibility splay would pass through has been removed from the red edge of the application. As such, it is not possible to ascertain if the required level of visibility can be achieved. In addition, the proposed bin collection point would be located within the visibility splay, which would impede drivers exiting from the site to the detriment of highway safety.

No turning facilities have been provided within the proposed development, which may lead to vehicles reversing out onto the highway. In order to manoeuvre into the spaces immediately to the east of the access, the vehicle would block the access point to other users, which result in congestion on the adopted highway.

The waste management section have confirmed that a refuse vehicle would not be able to manoeuvre within the site and have requested a bin collection point. The bin collection point has been located on the pavement, which forms part of the adopted highway. The pavement is 1.5 metres in width, which would leave 0.6 metres available for pedestrians to use on collection day. This would not be wide enough for wheelchair users or prams and would reduce the width of the pavement to a substandard level. As such, would be detrimental to pedestrian safety.

There is insufficient information in relation to the two redundant accesses and how these would be reinstated to the adjacent footway levels.

The Traffic Section has recommended refusal - lack of information - proposed access, car parking, bin storage, impact on adjacent highway, surface water drainage.

Given the above, the proposed development would be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety and would conflict with Policies EN1/2, H2/1 and H2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Parking - The proposed development is located in a low access area as defined in SPD11, which relates to parking standards. The maximum parking standard in SPD11 for dwellings are:

- 2 spaces per 1 bed dwelling
- 3 spaces per 3 bed dwelling
- 3 spaces per 4 bed dwelling

This equates to 17 spaces.

The proposed development would provide 10 spaces and 3 garages, although SPD11 confirms that garages do not count towards the parking standards. As this is a low access area, the maximum parking standards allow for provision for any visitors to the site. The level of parking proposed would not be sufficient and would lead to vehicles parking on the highway to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy HT2/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD11.

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

The agent was asked to submit information as to how the proposed development would comply with Policy JP-S2 but no information has been submitted. As such, there is insufficient information to assess whether the proposed development would comply with this policy.

Digital connectivity - Policy JP-C2 requires development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting. The policy supports the provision of free, secure, high-speed public wi-fi connections, particularly in the most frequented areas.

The agent was asked to submit information as to how the proposed development would comply with Policy JP-C2 but no information has been submitted. As such, there is insufficient information to assess whether the proposed development would comply with this policy.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. 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 would, by reason of its size, 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 policy(ies) of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework:
Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
Policy H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development
Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development
- 2 The proposed development would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupier(s) of the proposed development, by reason of its size and position. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy(ies) of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
Policy H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development
- 3 The proposed development would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupier(s) of the adjoining dwelling house (No. 5 Oakley Close), by reason of its size and position. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy(ies) of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
Policy H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development

- 4 The design of the proposed bin collection point is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the area and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy(ies) of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
Policy H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development
Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development
- 5 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in relation to biodiversity net gain to enable the impact upon the biodiversity on site to be properly assessed. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-G8 - A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act.
- 6 The proposed access arrangements are substandard and are highly likely to lead to unacceptable conflicts on the A667 Ringley Road West in close proximity to the Oakley Close junction, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan:
Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
Policy H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development
Policy JP-C5 - Streets for All
Policy JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling
Policy JP-C8 - Transport Requirements of New Development
- 7 The proposed parking and turning facilities are substandard, and are highly likely to lead to unacceptable conflicts on the adopted highway and within the proposed development, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan:
EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development
HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development
JP-C5 - Streets for All
JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling
JP-C8 - Transport Requirements of New Development
Supplementary Planning Document 11 - Parking Standards in Bury
- 8 The proposed bin storage/refuse collection arrangements shown on the adopted highway would result in an unacceptable obstruction of the adopted footway on Ringley Road West and would restrict visibility to substandard levels at the junction of the proposed site access, to the detriment of pedestrian and road safety. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan:
EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development
JP-C5 - Streets for All
JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling.
JP-C8 - Transport Requirements of New Development
- 9 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient topographical survey based information to properly assess the physical impact the proposed development and its access and parking facilities will have on the adjacent adopted highway. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan:
EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design

DELEGATED REPORT

H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development
HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development
JP-C5 - Streets for All
JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling.
JP-C8 - Transport Requirements of New Development
Supplementary Planning Document 11 - Parking Standards in Bury.

- 10 The application and submitted plans and supporting statements contain insufficient information to enable the local planning authority to assess whether the proposal would maximise reductions in carbon emissions, as required by Policy JP-S2 - Carbon and Energy of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 11 The application and submitted plans and supporting statements contain insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal would comprise high quality digital infrastructure, as required by Policy JP-C2 - Digital Connectivity of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HL - 30/04/2025			