

1 The proposed development would result in the loss of recreation land which currently provides valuable open space provision in association with an established residential development and for the residents it serves and which would therefore be seriously detrimental to the residential and visual amenities of the local residents. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that alternative provision of equivalent community benefit would be provided, that the site is surplus to requirement or that recreation would be retained and enhanced through redevelopment of a small part of the site. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies RT1/1 - Protection of Recreation Provision in the Urban Area, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and Paragraph 99 of the NPPF.

- Proposal incorporates a public play area with the play equipment providing a high-quality public amenity to offset the loss of open space.

2 The proposed access, parking and turning facilities are sub-standard and are likely to lead to vehicles parking and carrying out manoeuvres on the adjacent estate roads and in close proximity to the Kingston Close/Finchley Close junction, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies H2/2 – The Layout of New Residential Development, HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.

- Near all houses on the estate have identical parking arrangements whereby individual drives are provided directly from the roads with similar distances of drives to the junctions.
- Image below demonstrates the identical parking arrangements of the adjacent dwelling.



3 The application and submitted plans contain inconsistent and insufficient, topographical survey based information to properly assess the following:

- Impact any intensified pedestrian access to/egress from the 'community facilities/recreation area' would have on Kingston Close or whether the provision of measures to protect children from entering the carriageway are required, in the interests of pedestrian safety.

- Physical impact of the development on the adjacent adopted highways;
- Retention of adequate visibility splays in accordance with the standards in Manual for Streets at the junctions of Kingston Close with Newham Drive and Finchley Close with Kingston Close;
- Retention of adequate levels of forward visibility on Kingston Close in accordance with the standards in Manual for Streets;
- Provision of adequate visibility splays in accordance with the standards in Manual for Streets at the junction of the proposed accesses with Kingston Close;
- Provision of porous/permeable driveway materials and/or measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the adjacent adopted highway;
- Provision of in-curtilage bin storage facilities at each plot in accordance with Waste Management's 'Guide to Refuse Collection Requirements & Storage Methods for New Developments'.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development and HT6/2 - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict.

- Landscaping plan clearly states permeable block paving to the individual drives, as such no water will discharge onto the highways
- Waste collection as identified is easily achieved as the properties have sufficient amenity space to allow for them to be provided in their rear garden space.
- The submitted playground design clearly states a fence was to be provided to the boundary of the playground facilities and had we been liaised with; further clarification could have been provided. And the playground facility would have achieved equal to or better protection of the area than the current low level single rail fence.
- Highways, as identified in our response to refusal comment 2, has been considered and the driveways and pedestrian access to the houses is identical to that already on the adjacent development.

4 The application and submitted plans contains insufficient information to enable them to be properly assessed with regards to the siting and impact of the proposed development and associated structures/hardstandings/foundations in relation to the main water pipe which crosses the site. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan policies H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design and the principles of the NPPF.

- The main water pipe was considered, and we liaised prior to the application with the statutory body to clarify the type position, depth, and easement required. This is then clearly shown on the proposal including the easement such that the properties are set out accordingly.

5 The design of the proposed dwellings, by virtue of the disproportionate depth of roof and pitched roof form would result in an unbalanced and discordant appearance within the streetscene form which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/1 - The Form of New residential Development and EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design.

- The styling and materials are all proposed as the adjacent properties, the eaves and roofline are similar if not identical to those around it and we consider the design sympathetic to the existing housing estate. Note, under permitted development rights the adjacent properties would all be able to have dormers similar in characteristics to those proposed.

6 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient and conflicting information with regards to the proposals to provide recreational facilities as identified as 'Recreational Area' on the proposed site plan dwg 212 rev D to enable them to be properly assessed.

- It is clear from the submitted information the intention to provide a play facility as backed up by the playground equipment manufacturers document also submitted.
- Had we been informed about the concerns prior to the refusal the majority, if not all, of the concerns could have been clarified and overcome.