

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 02/07/2026	Ref: 73161/FUL
Registration: 15/05/2026	LDFC: 10/06/2026	Expiry Date: 10/07/2026
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Erection of 4 no. dwellings

Location: 72 Park Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0FA

Description

The application relates to a corner plot of land in a residential area. The site is bounded by No 70 Park Road, a semi detached house to the south and No 71 Brooklands Road, a semi detached house to the east (rear) and is located close to a 4-way junction and mini-roundabout.

The site has been vacant for some time following the demolition and clearance of a large 2 storey single dwelling which formally accommodated the site.

The site is bounded by a brick wall and there is an existing driveway to the south off Park Road and a pedestrian gated access from Brooklands Road.

The application proposes the erection of 2 no detached dwellings (plots 1 and 2) and a pair of semi-detached dwellings (plot 3 and 4).

Plot 1 would be located on the corner of Park Road and Brooklands Road and plot 4 adjacent to No 70 Park Road.

The front of the site and proposed dwellings would face Park Road set in a linear row. Plots 2, 3 and 4 would have double driveways accessed directly off Park Road and would provide 2 parking spaces for each dwelling. Parking for plot 1 would be located in the north east corner of the site accessed from Brooklands Road. Bins and a cycle store would be located at the side of each property and at the rear there would be garden amenity space.

The landscape plan proposes retention of the hedge along Brooklands Road, new hedge planting to the frontages and rear gardens divided by 1.8m high fencing.

The dwellings would be 3 storey in height which includes room in the roofspace/dormers.

The semi detached properties plots 1 and 2 would be 6 bed properties and provide living accommodation at the ground floor, 3 no bedrooms at first floor and 3 no bedrooms at the second floor.

The detached properties would be 5 bed properties with accommodation at the ground floor, 3 no beds at first floor and 2 no beds at the second floor.

The proposed dwellings would have red brick elevations with render infill panels, grey roof tiles and black window frames.

Relevant Planning History

62178 - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 no. dwellings (2 no. detached and pair of semi-detached) - Approve with Conditions 16/01/2018

DELEGATED REPORT

64642 - Erection of 4 no. storey block of 9 no. flats with basement car parking and landscaping - Approve with Conditions 18/12/2019
67039 - Variation of condition 02 (approved plans) of planning permission 62178 for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 no. dwellings (2 no. detached and pair of semi-detached) to add single storey extensions to dwelling types B & C and minor amendments to the external levels. - Approve with Conditions 26/08/2021
68707 - Creation of one detached house and two semi detached houses - Approve with Conditions 27/10/2022
71354 - Erection of 6 no. semi detached dwellings and associated driveways - Refused 19/05/2025

Publicity

Letters sent to 46 properties on 19/5/26.

One support and one comment received -

Support

- Strongly support this planning application. The site has remained an empty and derelict plot for several years, which has been an ongoing eyesore within the neighbourhood.
- Believe the proposed development is entirely in keeping with the character and style of the surrounding residential properties and will provide a significant improvement to the appearance of the area.
- The scheme represents a positive and appropriate use of the land, enhancing the local environment while complementing the existing community.

Comment

- Request that if approved include a condition to incorporate swift bricks on one per dwelling basis, this would be in line with guidance from RIBA/CIEEM and the motion passed unanimously two years ago by Bury council.
- The report from GMEU also advises use of swift bricks, the point of the universal swift brick, BS 42021 is that it can be used universally by several small red listed species, including House Sparrows and Starlings as well as Swifts, so there is no need to use an alternative.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommend refusal

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objections subject to conditions

Waste Management - No response received

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No objection subject to condition for a drainage scheme

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objection

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objection

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
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling

JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PfE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the

exercise of its functions.

Principle

The site is located in an urban and residential area and would not conflict with the local environment in terms of surrounding land uses and character of development for residential purposes. There is existing infrastructure in place to facilitate the development.

The site has previously been granted planning permission for residential development. There have been no changes to planning policy which would restrict a residential development on this site.

As such the site has an established residential use and the principle for a residential development has been previously accepted.

Density

The NPPF supports the efficient use of land, and 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, with this site falling in an area where a minimum net residential density of 50 dwellings per hectare applies.

The supporting statement states the site is 0.15ha. which would equate to 7.5 no. dwellings (or rounded down to 7 no. dwellings) which would not be in accordance with this policy requirement.

However, JP-H4 also 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 design context and any potential impact on the wider landscape or townscape including heritage assets and green infrastructure.

The development would under-provide the level of housing required on this site and although there has been an approval on site for 9 flats which would exceed density for this site, there has also been an approval for 4 no dwellings which is an extant permission given pre-commencement conditions have been discharged and a start on site made by the demolition of the existing building. This would be a fallback position.

Type, Size and Design of New Housing

In accordance with JP-H3, all new dwellings 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 Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The proposed development would provide acceptable levels of living and bedroom accommodation in compliance with Policy JP-H3.

The accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations could need to be secured by condition.

Layout

The dwellings would front Park Road formed in a linear row similar to the arrangement of the adjacent houses on Park Road. However the existing houses have a regimented building line along the street, as do the houses opposite, and this arrangement characterises the street and area. The footprint of the dwellings would be set further forward of the adjacent houses by 3.5m and as such the proposed development would disrupt the rhythm of the streetscape and character of the area..

In terms of amenity space, due to the irregular rear boundary, each property would have

varying levels of garden space.

SPD6 advises that 7m should be retained between a 2 storey habitable room window and a directly facing boundary, with additional separation required where there would be a difference in levels or additional storey. As such there should be a distance of 10m from a 2nd floor habitable room window to a directly facing boundary.

Plot 4 (5 bed detached) would have the smallest garden which would have an irregular shape due to the angle of the boundary to No 71. For a 6 bedroomed property, the size of the proposed garden is considered to be inadequate.

At the narrowest point there would be a distance of 4.4m from the single storey rear projection. This would be acceptable given there would be a boundary fence which would screen the majority of the ground floor window. There would be a distance of 7.2m from the 1st floor habitable room window to the rear boundary with No 71 Brooklands Road which would comply with SPD6. However, this property would have a 2nd floor with a wide habitable room window to a bedroom and given the distance of 7.2m to the rear boundary would not comply with SPD6.

Plots 1,2 (6 bed semi-detached) and plot 3 (5 detached) would provide acceptable levels of amenity space and separation distances and would be policy compliant.

Each property would have bin and cycle storage located at the side of the dwellings. SPD11 requires new dwellings to provide 1 secure covered cycle store per bedroom. The proposed plans show one cycle stand (uncovered) would be provided for each dwelling and as such would not be policy compliant.

In terms of parking, each property would have its own driveway and parking for 2 cars. Parking for plot 1 would be accessed from a new driveway off Brooklands Road, the position of which has been previously approved and considered acceptable.

Plots 2, 3 and 4 would have new double driveways accessed from Park Road. The driveway access to plot 2 would be affected by the traffic calming features at this part of the highway and result in the loss of on street parking. This arrangement would not be acceptable to Highways and is discussed further below.

It is therefore considered that given the scale and siting of the proposed dwellings, the development would result in sub-standard amenity space, aspect standards, cycle parking and access arrangements, which would be considered unacceptable and contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2, SPD6 and SPD11.

Design and appearance

Whilst the surrounding area comprises houses of varying styles and design, the row of properties adjacent to the site on Park Road are all 2 storey semi-detached hip roof types with uniform eaves level and roof heights.

Policy JP-P1 - Sustainable Places states that new development should respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials use.

The National Design Guide states that development should understand and relate appropriately to the site and its local and wider context. Well-designed development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary, taking into account the existing built development including layout, scale and appearance.

The proposed dwellings would be 3 storey which includes rooms in the roofspace and dormers. A streetscene plan has been provided which shows the adjacent detached

properties would follow the same ridge and eaves height as No 70 Park Road. Whilst the proposed semi-detached houses would be higher, this would be marginal and considered not to be detrimental to the streetscene in terms of visual amenity. However, the proposed dwellings would project 3.5m forward of the row of houses on this side of Park Road on which there is a regimented and regular building line and as such would result in jarring and discordant additions within the street scene.

Fenestrations and elevations comprise a number of different elements and design features of projecting gables, flat roof porches, mansard style roof and flat and pitched dormers. The proposed dwellings and particularly the semi-detached properties would have a disjointed and ad hoc appearance and as such would appear incongruous within the streetscene.

As such, in terms of design and appearance, the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to policies EN1/2, H2/1 and JP-P1.

Residential amenity

SPD6 contains supplementary guidance on separation distances to surrounding properties and is used to assess relationships of existing properties to new development. A separation distance of 13m between a principal ground floor habitable room window and a 2 storey blank wall is generally considered to be acceptable.

A distance of 7m is generally required from 1st floor habitable room windows to directly facing boundaries with additional separation subject to levels changes or additional storeys

The proposed dwellings would be located on a plot of land at the junction of Park Road and Brooklands Road.

Whilst the proposed dwellings would be set forward of No 70 Park Road, there would be a separation of 2.6m to plot 4 and as such it is considered there would not be a significantly harmful impact on the outlook, privacy or light to the front of No 70.

To the rear of the site is No 71 Brooklands Road. This property is set at an angle to the site and would share a boundary to plots 2, 3 and 4. Plot 1 would not have an interface with No 71 and as such there would be no amenity issues.

Plot 2 would be located more than 15m from the boundary to No 71 and as such would be acceptable.

SPD6 would require 13m separation from a 2nd floor habitable room window to a directly facing boundary.

From the second floor of plot 3 there would be a minimum distance of approximately 12m to the boundary with No 71. This would be from a 2nd floor bathroom window and as such there would not be any overlooking issues. The distance from the proposed 2nd floor bedroom window would be sub-standard. However, this window would face the gable of No 71 and impacts on privacy would be limited.

Plot 4 would have the closest relationship to No 71 given the irregular building line at this point of the site.

There would be a minimum distance of 7.3m from the 2nd floor to the rear boundary. The bathroom window to the 2nd floor would be acceptable. However, the bedroom window would directly face the boundary and the garden of No 71. A similarly sub-standard separation distance has previously been accepted for this site (ref 68707). However in that case, the windows would be slimline in design and it was considered opportunities for overlooking from those windows would be minimised.

The proposed development and plot 4 in particular would therefore result in sub-standard separation distances and therefore contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2 and SPD6.

Highway issues

Parking

SPD11 has since been updated since the previous applications and approvals. The site is located in Zone 4 and for houses with 4 or more bedrooms, requires 3 no. parking spaces per dwelling be provided.

The development proposes 2 no. spaces per dwelling which would be contrary to the updated SPD.

The applicant could argue that there is an extant consent for 4 no x 4 bed dwellings (ref 62178) each with 2 parking spaces and a subsequent approval (ref 68707) for 3 no. dwellings comprising 1 x 6 no. bed and 2 x 5 no. bed where 2 spaces per dwelling were approved.

A total of 16 bedrooms would have been provided for each of these developments.

This application proposes 4 dwellings (2 x 5 bed and 2 x 6 bed) with a total of 22 no. bedrooms, a significant increase comparative to the two previous approvals. Given the scale of development now proposed, the updated SPD11 is considered to be relevant and reasonable to apply in this case as the proposed development would under provide parking for a significantly intensified development.

This application also proposes double driveways off Park Road which would result in an unacceptable loss of on-street parking as well as conflicting with the existing traffic calming feature at this point of Park Road comparative to previous consents which proposed parallel parking and which limited movements of vehicles on and off the driveways, particularly as the site is located close to the mini roundabout and road junctions.

The proposed plans are also poor and lack details of how the development would connect and relate to the highway.

It is therefore considered the proposed development would be contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2, HT2/4, JP-C5, JP-C6, JP-C8 and SPD11.

Cycle storage

SPD11 requires 1 secured, covered cycle storage space per bedroom. For this development 5 no cycle spaces for the detached properties and 6 no cycle spaces for the semi-detached properties would be required. The proposed plans show 1 cycle space per dwelling.

As such the proposed development would be contrary to SPD11.

Ecology

Summary

The developer would need to purchase off-site biodiversity units. Otherwise there are no significant issues.

Protected Species

GMEU are satisfied that it is very unlikely that there will be any protected species issues associated with this development. Whilst bats could theoretically roost in the bat boxes on the mature tree, the tree is to be retained.

GMEU recommend a condition is applied to any permission.

Nesting Birds

A length of hedgerow are bramble scrub are proposed for removal potential bird nesting habitat. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. GMEU recommend a condition to restrict tree/vegetation removal.

Other Wildlife

Vegetation on the site has now developed sufficiently to provide cover for small mammals and amphibians. GMEU recommend a condition for a precautionary working measure method statement for small mammals and amphibians.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 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 would result in the loss of grassland and scrub on the site of what was previously a dwelling and garden. Wildlife issues are restricted to nesting birds and loss of bat roosting potential associated with the now demolished dwelling.

A biodiversity net gain assessment has been provided. This indicates a shortfall of 0.64 area based units and 0.1 hedge units to achieve 10% net gain. There are no river units for this site. GMEU have no issues with the BNG assessment or metric. As gardens are to be created there is no real potential to increase the on-site value of the site. The amount required is unlikely to make the development unviable. As the on-site measures only include gardens, no HMMP for the on-site measures will be required and therefore no HMMP condition or legal agreement.

To discharge the statutory condition, the developer would have to demonstrate that the off-site units have been acquired and registered with defra and provide the biodiversity gain plan and final version of the statutory metric.

For wildlife GMEU would recommend provision of one bird box per dwelling (swift brick unless it can be demonstrated another species would clearly benefit more) and two bat boxes across the site. The details can be provided via condition.

JP-C2 - Digital connectivity

The applicant states that the proposed dwellings would be designed and constructed to facilitate full fibre-to-the-premises (FTTP) broadband infrastructure, subject to connection by the relevant statutory network providers.

Appropriate service routes, ducting and associated infrastructure will be incorporated within the development to enable the provision of high-speed digital connectivity and operational broadband services to each dwelling.

The proposed development would comply with JP-C2.

JP-S2 - Carbon and energy

The applicant states the proposed development has been designed having regard to energy efficiency principles and will be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Building Regulations Part L 2022 standards in force at the time of construction.

The dwellings would incorporate a range of measures intended to reduce energy demand and improve operational efficiency, including:

- High-performance thermal building fabric;
- Enhanced insulation to walls, roofs and floors;
- High efficiency double glazed windows and external doors;
- Energy efficient lighting installations;
- Modern heating and hot water systems;
- Appropriate air tightness and contemporary construction detailing.

Each dwellinghouse would have an EV chargepoint.

The proposed development would comply with JP-S2.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of privacy currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No 71 Brooklands Road by reason of the sub-standard distances between habitable windows on the proposed rear elevation of plot 4 and the amenity space of that property. The proposed development therefore conflicts with UDP policies H2/1, H2/2 and SPD6.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of the siting and poor design of the proposed dwellings would introduce discordant and jarring features within the streetscene and as such would be detrimentally harmful to the character of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to UDP policies H2/1, H2/2 and EN1/2.
- 3 There is insufficient car parking and secure covered cycle storage provided for the development to comply with the Council's parking standards in respect of the proposed development. The proposed development therefore conflicts with UDP Policy HT2/4 and SPD11.
- 4 The size of plot site is inadequate to accommodate the development proposed whilst satisfying reasonable requirements for space about the dwelling. The proposed development therefore conflicts with UDP Policies H2/1, H2/2 and SPD6.
- 5 The proposed access and parking arrangements are sub-standard, which is likely to lead to conflicts on the adopted highway in close proximity to the adjacent mini-roundabout and existing traffic calming features, which would be detrimental to highway safety and maintaining the free flow of traffic on the adjacent highways. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to UDP policies H2/2, HT2/4 and PfE Policies JP-C5, JP-C6 and JP-C8.
- 6 The proposal would result in the loss of existing on street parking facilities, which is likely to lead to the displacement of parking elsewhere on Park Road, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to UDP policies H2/1, H2/2, HT2/4, and PfE policies JP-C5, JP-C6 and JP-C8.
- 7 The proposed accesses are sub-standard in terms of visibility at the back edge of the footway, which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to UDP Policy H2/2 and PfE policies JP-C5, JP-C6 and JP-C8.
- 8 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient and incomplete information in order for the proposed physical impact on and arrangements at the interface with the adopted highway to be properly assessed. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to PfE Policies JP-C5, JP-C6 and JP-C8.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	HL	<u>Date 3/7/26</u>
JT	2/7/26			