

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 17/06/2025	Ref: 71905/PIP
Registration: 08/05/2025	LDfC: 12/06/2025	Expiry Date: 12/06/2025
Site Visit: 20/05/2025	Site Notice: 20/05/2025	Press Date: 22/05/2025
Objections: 9	Con Area: HOLC	Adv Type: CA
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Permission in principle for the removal of barn/storage shed and erection of 1no. three bedroom detached dwelling

Location: Land between 145 and 115 Holcombe Old Road, Bury, BL8 4NF

Description

The site relates to a piece of land between Nos 115 and 145 Holcombe Old Road, which contains 2 buildings. The larger building was in use as a barn and the smaller building as a storage shed and the remainder of the site is grassed. There is a stone wall along the boundary with Holcombe Old Road and a gated access adjacent to No. 145 Holcombe Old Road.

The applicant seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for 1 dwelling.

A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing-led development which separately assesses the consideration of principle for proposed development 'Stage 1', from the technical detail of the development 'Stage 2'.

This application relates to the Stage 1 of the process, to establish the principle aspect of the development for residential on this site.

The submission of a valid PiP application requires a completed application form, plan which identifies the land to which the application relates and the correct fee. There are no other details or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP. The application does include a Planning Statement.

A decision must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan and material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework.

To assess PiP applications, an Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) consideration is limited to location, land use and amount of development, with other matters considered at technical details stage.

Local Planning Authorities consult anybody that would be required to be consulted in relation to an application for planning permission but matters relating to ecology, landscaping, contamination, design, transport/highways and heritage are considered in a Stage 2 Technical Details application. Any responses received can be included as informatives notes to advise the applicant of the requirements at a technical details stage.

Conditions cannot be attached to a PiP.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 13 May 2025 and a press notice was published in the Bury Times on 22 May 2025. A site notice was posted on 20 May 2025.

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

- The principle of the development does not accord with the local plan or the NPPF.
- The site is located within the conservation area and the green belt.
- The proposal would fail to meet the requirements for limited infilling as the proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the area and all the other properties front directly onto Holcombe Old Road and do not have a wall.
- The gap is over 40 metres long and the proposal would be a stand alone building in a previously undeveloped field.
- The proposal would have an unacceptable impact upon the occupiers of No. 145 by virtue of sightlines into the garden and drainage impacts.
- The loss of the agricultural field would impact upon views across the area and the character of the village would be substantially altered.
- We do not consider that a PIP application is the appropriate form of application as a detailed review of the impacts upon the conservation area and green belt are required.
- SPD8 requires the demonstration of very special circumstances is required for developments in Conservation Areas. No such case has been provided.
- Query where the access to the remainder of the field would be located. The plans indicate a replacement access on a strip of land near 115 but this is marked on the plans as 'area given to biodiversity enhancement'.
- Approaching Peel Tower and the walk up the hill, visitors are met with open fields and charming 18th and 17th century cottages which remain traditional and to the present day have strict regulations imposed to maintain the character and atmosphere. The planning application for a modern detached house in no way enhances or preserves the character of this lovely area and can only be described as a "monstrous carbuncle".
- It is difficult to see how the proposed substantial, modern, two storey, three bedroom, detached house, adjacent to Holcombe Old Road preserves or enhances the Holcombe Conservation Area.
- The present barn and storage shed are still in use as agricultural buildings. This should continue with any necessary upgrades.
- The Metropolitan Borough of Bury (Holcombe Conservation Area) Article 4 Direction 2016 removes permitted development rights including change of use of agricultural buildings to dwelling houses.
- If approved it will set an unfortunate precedent and encourage others in the Holcombe Conservation Area to convert agricultural buildings to domestic dwellings.
- Holcombe Old Road is a public bridleway and is used by many people. The site is prominent and viewed from Lumb Carr Road and Holcombe Old Road.
- This part of the conservation area is characterised by short terraces of stone cottages and some individual and paired cottages interspersed by field gaps.
- The proposed dwelling would be a significantly more dominant structure and out of kilter with the adjacent dwellings. The use of dormers would reduce the height, but these are not a design feature of the cottages on Holcombe Old Road. A single storey dwelling would bring a range of design conflicts. As a matter of principle, in terms of location, a dwelling in this position should not be supported due to conflict with the conservation area designation.
- There is a statutory duty on the LPA to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area and given the identifiable likely harm to the character and appearance there is a strong reason to refuse development in principle at this location. NPPF paragraph 11 (d) (i) and footnote 7 apply. The location land should not therefore be considered 'grey belt' and substantial weight should continue to be given to any harm to the Green Belt at this location, and any other harm, in accordance with NPPF 153.
- The intrusive linear spread, encroaching on the countryside, would be seen acutely both from Lumb Carr Road and Holcombe Old Road. None of the exceptions at NPPF 154 should be applied

- Not to be overlooked is the historic connection between the farm hamlet of Little Holcombe, also within the Conservation Area 100m to the south east, and the adjacent fields of which the application is part. A small gate into the Stump Field just above the Branch gives access from across Lumb Carr Road to inclines in the field. Towards the village an enclosure, at the north end of Holcombe Old Road near to Cross Lane, was known as Little Holcombe Close and no doubt represented an allocation of one-time open common land to Little Holcombe as a private 'close' or enclosure. A dwelling in the location proposed would 'wall off' some vestigial evidence of that relationship and finally sever the vital agrarian setting. The current use meanwhile has a relationship of sorts to the historic pattern in that at least it is agricultural. Moreover, the existing timber shed occupies only a part, about one fifth (20%), of the overall gap the proposed dwelling would take up with its accompanying curtilage, including parking, gardens, and all the associated trapping of domesticity.
- This area has conservation stipulations which seem to have been left out in the cold. Bury Council put in place an article 4 on a conservation area. There are other areas which could be developed for housing. This area should be kept to its original aspect on a cobbled stone bridle path.
- This application appears to be being processed by delegated powers which I believe is totally inappropriate. The attempt to avoid the committee address is reprehensible for this application. we are seeing an attempt to change use of an old agricultural field to contain a permanent residential dwelling.
- Such an application needs serious scrutiny by the Conservation Officer as the Council has duties of care in this high grade Article 4 Conservation Area (CA) to make sure that any development permitted must enhance and preserve the CA - both houses and landscape, important vistas etc.
- To construct an entirely modern house, inconsistent with the whole ethos of the stone cottages, bordering this ancient road, would seem to run a cart and horses through the character of the CA.
- Further to my previous objection , I have now been appraised that the current planning document under consideration is a permission in principle application and not planning application, so delegated powers are appropriate at this stage of the process.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No objections in principle.

Drainage Section - No response

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objection in principle.

Conservation Officer - No objections in principle.

Public Rights of Way Officer - No objections in principle.

Waste Management - No response.

Strategic Planning & Infrastructure - Object as proposal would not make an efficient use of the land and the site is not in a sustainable location.

GM Ecology Unit - No objection in principle.

United Utilities - No objection in principle

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
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
RT3/4	Recreational Routes

DELEGATED REPORT

HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P7	Sport and Recreation
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 - The Permission in Principle (PiP) application seeks to establish whether in principle, the site is suitable for a residential development for 1 dwelling. Consideration of PiP applications are limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

Consultations of the planning application can be carried out but conditions cannot be attached to a PiP approval.

The issues to establish acceptance of the proposed PiP development are analysed below.

Green Belt - The application site falls within the Green Belt as designated under PfE policy JP-G9.

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF is clear that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it meets the listed exceptions. The proposal does not meet any of the exceptions listed within paragraph 154.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that the development of homes in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a) The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b) There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- c) The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
- d) Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.

Grey belt is defined by the NPPF as "land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development."

The application site does not impact assets referred to in footnote 7. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to any purposes (a), (b) or (d) of paragraph 143.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that Green Belt serves 5 purposes, and those of relevance are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; and
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Planning guidance published on 27 February 2025 for assessing a site against these purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision making (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl - The site is near to the built-up area of Holcombe Brook and the village of Holcombe. The development would not result in an incongruous pattern of development as the site is located in between two dwellings and other ribbon development along Holcombe Old Road. Therefore, it is considered that the site makes a moderate contribution toward Purpose (a).

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighbouring towns merging - The guidance specifies this is in reference to the merging of towns, not villages. The site does not form a substantial gap between the towns of Ramsbottom and Bury, or any other town. The site would be able to be developed without any significant impact on the visual separation of towns. As such it is considered that the site makes a weak contribution toward purpose (b).

As the site does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes (a) or (b), the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land. However, for the proposal to be considered as not inappropriate development it must satisfy all of the criterion, a to c, listed in NPPF paragraph 155.

Criterion A Considering the impact on the remaining Green Belt in the plan area - This criterion requires that the development would not fundamentally undermine, the purposes, when taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. The guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 64-008-20250225) adds that in reaching this judgement, authorities should consider whether, or the extent to which, the release or development of Green Belt land would affect the ability of all the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in a meaningful way.

The only other Green Belt purpose which would be breached by the proposal is Purpose C safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as the development would represent an irreversible encroachment of built form into the countryside. However, the area to be lost is small in relation to the totality of the remaining Green Belt land both in the local area, and the wider plan area. The site is adjacent to a small 'hub' of existing homes along Holcombe Old Road and open undeveloped fields would continue to surround the community on both the east and the west sites of Holcombe Old Road. Consequently, the overall effect on the countryside would be limited.

Therefore, it is considered that the development of the site in principle, which represents a small part of this parcel, would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Criterion B Demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed - This criterion requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need, which in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, means:

- A lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or

- Where the Housing Delivery Test is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

FIVE YEAR SUPPLY - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant under-delivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

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

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

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 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. 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 able to demonstrate a deliverable 5-year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

HOUSING DELIVERY TEST - The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

NPPF paragraph 80 requires the latest published HDT results to be used. However, the Government is currently operating to a delayed publication timetable for the HDT, and although the latest published results for 2023 are below 75%, based on the current HDT rulebook Bury's result for 2024 will be above 75% and the tilted balance will no longer be triggered by the housing delivery test result.

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

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of

land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

In this case, the site is located within the Green Belt so therefore paragraph 11 (d)(i) applies and the proposal needs to be assessed against Green Belt policies. The latest published HDT result for Bury also means that NPPF paragraph 155(b) is triggered, and there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

Criterion C Sustainable location - NPPF paragraph 155(c) requires consideration of whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework.

Paragraph 110 states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support the sustainable transport objectives in paragraph 109. Development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 115 states that development should ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised and safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Green Belt guidance (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 64-011-20250225) also states that when making decisions regarding planning applications on grey belt land, authorities should ensure that the development would be in a sustainable location.

The site is approximately 900m from the convergence of Bolton Road West with Longsight Road and the services within Holcombe Brook including public transport and shops. The site is a similar distance to the village centre of Holcombe. As such, given the distances involved, the site is not considered to be in a sustainable location nearby to the existing built-up area, with poor access to public transport and services. Therefore, this requirement is not met.

Housing

Density - Paragraph 130 of the NPPF seeks to ensure the efficient use of land, and to avoid homes being built at low densities. It states that Local Planning Authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land.

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. The site falls in an area where a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare should be had regard to.

The proposal is for 1 dwelling, therefore equates to 11 dwellings per hectare which would not comply with the density requirements. Therefore, the proposed development would not make efficient use of the land and would conflict with Policy JP-H4 and the NPPF

Landscape Character - The site is within the Holcombe to Greenmount and Higher Summerseat Landscape Character Area, an area of open moorlands and enclosed upland fringes (west/south Pennines) as assessed by the GM Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment. The impact of the type and broad quantum of development on the site and the effect on the visual receptors are the key aspects under consideration at this stage however, consideration of the impact of the layout, massing, design and scale at the technical details stage upon the LCA will be essential.

No information has been submitted regarding the landscape or visual impact of the development.

The development would result in up to a new home at Holcombe Old Road, a cobbled street which is within a conservation area and characterised by small cottages. As such, the sensitivity of the immediate area to change is high and the residual landscape character effect in principle, considered to be high. Albeit the impact of the layout, massing, design and scale at the technical details stage will be critical.

Conclusion - The site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land but would fail to satisfy criterion c as it would not be in a sustainable location.

NPPF paragraph 155(d) and the 'Golden Rules' are not considered to be applicable in this case, because the application is not for major development.

The amount of development proposed is not in accordance with the density requirements set out in PfE Policy JP-H4 and the NPPF.

Therefore, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

Consultee responses

Strategic Planning & Infrastructure

TYPE, SIZE AND DESIGN OF NEW HOUSING - PfE Policy JP-H3 - Seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes. PfE Policy JP-H3 also requires all new dwellings to comply with the nationally described space standards and be built to the 'accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. These requirements will need to be met at the Technical Details stage.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN - The proposal is required to provide a 10% gain in Biodiversity in accordance with both the provisions of the Environment Act 2021, and PfE Policy JP-G8.

CARBON AND ENERGY - The proposal is required to comply with Policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy. Details on what measures the applicants intended to put in place to comply with this policy will be required to be submitted at the Stage 2, Technical Details consent stage.

DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY - The proposal is required to comply with Policy JP-C2: Digital Connectivity. Confirmation will need to be sought at the Stage 2, Technical Details consent stage that full fibre will be provided as part of the proposal.

ACTIVE TRAVEL - Policy JP-C1 - An Integrated Network requires developments to be located and designed to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport.

Developments should prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Consideration should be given to providing pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to ensure that there is safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle access to the proposed development.

Details on what measures the applicants intended to put in place to comply with this policy will be required to be submitted at the Stage 2, Technical Details consent stage.

Highways/Public Right of Way

In the event that Permission in Principle is granted for the proposed development, as part of the subsequent technical details consent stage, the following aspects should be considered and full details submitted:

1. Improvements to the Bridleway No. 26, Ramsbottom to address restrictions along the route, lack of passing places and pedestrian facilities and restricted width and forward visibility.
2. Provision of adequate levels of visibility in accordance with the standards in Manual for

Streets at the junction of any site access with Holcombe Old Road/ Bridleway No. 26, Ramsbottom.

3. Provision of adequate parking and turning facilities within the curtilage of the site clear of Bridleway No. 26, Ramsbottom to minimise vehicle and pedestrian conflicts on the adjacent Public Right of Way.
4. Provision of bin storage arrangements within the curtilage of the site clear of Bridleway No. 26, Ramsbottom in accordance with Waste Management's 'Guide to Refuse Collection Requirements & Storage Methods for New Developments'.
5. Pre-commencement dilapidation survey of the sett-paved surface of Holcombe Old Road and scheme of remedial works in the event that damage is caused to the fragile surface by HGV's/delivery vehicles, taking into consideration the site's location in the Holcombe Conservation Area.
6. A scheme of mitigation measures required by Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (GMFRS) to overcome the site's emergency access deficiencies. The details/measures should incorporate the installation of a residential sprinkler/misting system at each dwelling meeting the requirements of BS 9251:2014, or other subsequent standard that meets the requirements of GMFRS, and thereafter maintained at all times.
7. Measures to ensure that the requirements of Approved Document B for Fire Service access/fire safety under the Building Regulations 2010 will be met, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Vehicular access for a fire appliance to within 45m of all points within the dwellings;
 - The access road should be a minimum width of 4.5m and capable of carrying 12.5 tonnes;
 - As the access road is more than 20m long, a turning circle, hammerhead, or other turning point for fire appliances will be required;
 - There should be a suitable fire hydrant within 165m of any dwelling.

The details/measures subsequently agreed should be implemented to the satisfaction of GMFRS before the dwellings are first occupied and thereafter maintained at all times.

Conservation Officer

New development within a conservation area must be exceptional and should be regarded as an opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Any subsequent application for planning permission would need to be accompanied by a heritage assessment of significance of the conservation area, Peel Tower and NDHA as a validation requirement in order for the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposal on the setting of Peel Tower the NDHA and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The existing boundary wall to the west of the site to Holcombe Old Road should be retained and maintained without loss or alteration

Any proposed parking hardstanding area would be required to be kept to a minimum and certainly significantly smaller than indicated on the submitted plan and should be stone flagged or setted.

The design of the proposed dwelling should not include roof dormer extensions as they are not an historical architectural feature of the conservation area and as such would represent an alien design feature impacting of the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the NDHA.

It is understood an application for 1 dwelling would not meet the policy requirement for the efficient use of land with regard to housing density. The applicant should be aware that if a further application for Permission in Principle or planning permission were to come forward for a scheme of greater density, the plan, form and layout of the proposed development would need to be assessed with regard to the greater impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Given the layout and architectural grain of the built environment of that part of the conservation area, being a more linear, a scheme with

greater density may not be as appropriate.

Contaminated Land

The site has formerly been in agricultural use as such there is the potential for contamination to be present. Furthermore, a sensitive end use is proposed. As such, to avoid pre-commencement conditions sufficient information must be submitted at Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, to demonstrate that no remedial measures are required or to agree such measures. Further information regarding Land Contamination and the planning process can be found in Bury Council's Developers Guide and on the Planning Portal.

Air Quality

For this type of development, it would be expected that parking would be included. The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Due to the scale of the proposed development, it is considered very unlikely that the proposed development could create an increase of more than 500 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the EPUK Guidance, an air quality assessment will not be required.

Bury Council has been identified by DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. To support the principles of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan in reducing levels of nitrogen dioxide and in order to manage current and future levels of air pollution Bury Council is encouraging the use of cleaner vehicles. As such and in line the requirements of the Building Regulations (The Building Regulations 2010, Approved Document S, Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles), as part of the Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, the developer should provide information regarding Electric Vehicle Infrastructure to the following specification:

- 1 no. electric vehicle (EV) charging point (minimum 7kW*) per dwelling/parking space.
- *Mode 3, 7kW (32A) single phase, or 22kW (32A) three phase, and for 50kW Mode 4 rapid charging may be required. British Standard BS EN 61851-1:2019 to be used.

Further information regarding minimum standards can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/transport/low-emission-and-electric-vehicles>.

Certification and photographic evidence of the installation of the agreed electric vehicle charge points will be required to be submitted to Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the development being brought into use. The infrastructure shall be maintained and operational in perpetuity.

GM Ecology Unit

The structures on site may have the potential to support roosting bats and other protected species such as barn owl. There also appear to be at least two waterbodies within 250 m of the site, which may support great crested newts. Therefore, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal to assess the site's potential to support protected species, including roosting bats, birds and great crested newts, will need to be undertaken at technical details stage. Based on the results of this PEA, further protected species surveys may be required prior to the granting of technical details consent. Additionally, unless the development qualifies as a self-build, the application will be subject to statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. Based on the small size of the site and the lack of high-quality habitats apparent on site, an overall 10% net gain should be feasible, either on or off site.

United Utilities

We strongly recommend that the applicant or any subsequent developer contacts United Utilities, using our pre-development enquiry service to discuss their proposals directly with our Developer Services team. They can find further advice, along with a pre-development enquiry form, on our website: Building & Developing - United Utilities Alternative ways to contact the team are available in the Appendix, Section 4.0 'Contacts'.

DRAINAGE - We strongly encourage all developments to include sustainable drainage systems to help manage surface water and to offer new opportunities for wildlife to flourish. We request that Local Planning Authorities and applicants do all they can to avoid surface water entering the public sewer. The flows that come from this surface water are very large when compared with the foul water that comes from toilets, showers, baths, washing machines, etc. It is the surface water that uses up a lot of capacity in our sewers and results in the unnecessary pumping and treatment of surface water at our pumping stations and treatment works. If new developments can manage flows through sustainable drainage systems that discharge to an alternative to the public sewer, it will help to minimise the likelihood of sewers spilling into watercourses and the flooding of homes and businesses. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) advise that surface water from new developments should be investigated and delivered in the following order of priority:

1. into the ground (infiltration);
2. to a surface water body;
3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
4. to a combined sewer.

Should the applicant receive Planning in Principle permission for this proposal, United Utilities will review the drainage element of any application for Technical Detail Consent in line with the surface water hierarchy. United Utilities will request evidence that the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and why more sustainable options are not achievable before a surface water connection to the public sewer is considered acceptable.

In the event that the applicant, or any subsequent developer, approaches United Utilities regarding a connection for surface water to the public sewer, it is likely that we will request evidence that the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and why more sustainable options are not achievable. This will be managed through either our 'S106 Sewer Connections' or 'S104 Adoptions' processes.

When considering their drainage proposal, the applicant should investigate the existence of any pipelines and/or apparatus that might impact their detailed design (see Section 'UNITED UTILITIES' PROPERTY, ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE').

United Utilities will not carry out an assessment on the acceptability of submitted drainage proposals in relation to our water pipelines when responding to a planning application. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that any detailed drainage plans comply with our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines' which can be found on our website: Working near our pipes - United Utilities. Failure to consider existing pipelines when designing a drainage proposal may result in the applicant having to redesign proposals at a later date.

UNITED UTILITIES' PROPERTY, ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE - It is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the existence of any pipelines that might cross or impact their proposed site and also to demonstrate the exact relationship between United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. The applicant should not rely solely on the detail contained within asset maps when considering a proposed layout.

It is important that the supporting information contained in the Appendix, Section 2.0 'United Utilities' Property, Assets and Infrastructure', is read in conjunction with this letter. This provides information that might impact a proposed layout and additional guidance that an applicant or developer must consider when United Utilities assets are located in, or in the locality of, the proposed site.

Where United Utilities' assets exist, it is essential that the applicant, or any subsequent developer, contacts our Developer Services team prior to commencing any works on site,

including trial holes, groundworks or demolition. See Appendix. Section 4.0 'Contacts'

WATER EFFICIENCY IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements in respect of water use for the construction of new build dwellings, exceeding the minimum standards required by Building Regulations. All new homes are required to meet the mandatory national standard of 125 litres of water used per person per day as set out in Building Regulations Approved Document G. Where there is a clear local need, a local planning authority's development plan policies can require new-build dwellings to meet the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres of water used per person per day. If your adopted development plan includes a policy that implements the tighter water efficiency standard for new-build dwellings in Part 3 of Building Regulations, you should ensure that this is a condition of any planning permission you may grant. You should also consider whether there is any adopted development plan policy relating to a water efficiency in the construction of non-residential development. As this is a matter for the local planning authority / building control body, United Utilities would not be involved in the discharge of conditions relating to water efficiency.

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

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development for 1 No dwelling on a 0.09ha site would not make optimal use of the potential of the site. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Chapter 11, particularly paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development would not be located in a sustainable location and would fail the tests set out in Paragraph 155 (c) in relation to Grey Belt Land. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HL - 17/06/2025		DM 23/06/25	