

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 04/03/2026	Ref: 72796/FUL
Registration: 02/02/2026	LDFC: 24/02/2026	Expiry Date: 09/03/2026
Site Visit: 06/02/2026	Site Notice: 06/02/2026	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 20	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for erection of 9 no. dwellings

Location: Land off Holcombe Grove/ South East Side Of Milltown Street, Radcliffe, Manchester M26

Description

The site is a vacant piece of land which is located between Holcombe Grove and Mill town Street. The application site is 0.4 hectares in area and is irregular in shape. It is not located within the Green Belt, but is in the River Valley.

There is a residential development of 14 no dwellings to the south east and the metrolink runs to south of the site beyond which is Coronation Park.

A PiP application for up to 9 no dwellings has previously been granted for the same site (ref 69420). A Technical Details application has not been submitted for this site.

A PiP application has also been granted for a piece of land immediately west of the application site (ref 70334). This site is also comprises 0.4 hectares of land. A Technical Details application has not been submitted to date.

This application is a resubmission of the previously approved PiP planning ref 69720 as this permission expires 27/6/26 and the applicant is seeking a fresh consent.

The applicant seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up to 9 no. dwellings. A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing-led development.

The PiP consent route has two stages. The first stage, the Permission in Principle, establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second stage is the Technical Details Consent when the detailed development proposals are assessed.

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.

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

69420 - Application for permission in principle for up to 9 no dwellings - Approved 27/6/23
Same application site)

70334 - Application for permission in principle for up to 9 no dwellings - Approved 14/2/24
(adjacent site)

Publicity

Letters sent to 99 properties on 3/2/26.

Site notice posted 6/2/26.

20 representations received with issues as follows -

Highway safety and Unsuitable Access

- The proposal relies on a private access road designed solely for existing residents. It is narrow and cannot safely accommodate the traffic intensity from 9 additional households. This places an unfair burden on private infrastructure not maintained at public expense.
- Our estate is home to many young children. The introduction of large construction vehicles and heavy plant machinery via our residential road poses a severe risk to pedestrian safety. The existing road geometry cannot support such vehicles without dangerous modification.
- Should these new dwellings be granted planning and built, access must be via Milltown Street
- There is no continuous foot path along part of Holcombe Grove and no footpath whatsoever along the main body of Holcombe Grove. Allowing access to these proposed new dwellings via Holcombe Grove more than doubles the risks to all pedestrians.
- Roadway deficiencies for emergency vehicles. Any increase in traffic causes increased issues for emergency vehicles.
- The entrance of Holcombe Grove from New Road is totally inadequate for vehicles, due to its width and sharp corners and is dangerous.
- There is also serious doubt as to whether lawful access even exists. The red line plan appears to rely on land not owned by the applicant, with only limited agricultural access rights historically in place. Residential and construction access would go far beyond that.
- Previous applications for this site have been refused, including on grounds of unsuitable access and local constraints. None of the issues identified earlier have changed. The problems remain exactly the same-and development pressures cannot override safety, suitability or planning principles.
- Planning permission be refused on highway safety grounds, in line with the concerns raised by the Council's Highways Engineer.
- Holcombe Grove is a private road with maintenance paid for by residents
- Access both for construction and for residents, visitors and deliveries once the new development is built this will cause excessive damage to the area that current residents pay for the maintenance of.
- Additional development on currently green land could cause changes to the drainage of rainwater into our soakaway leading to higher maintenance costs and greater wear and tear.
- Utilities installation would require excavation along the only access route, further disrupting residents and increasing health and safety risks.
- Conclusion - Holcombe Grove is: Too narrow, lacking pavements, poorly aligned at its junction with New Road, already hazardous, a private road never intended to serve additional dwellings.

Amenity

- The construction noise, dust, and permanent loss of privacy constitute unneighbourly over-development.
- Our property contains a first floor window directly facing the site. The erection of two-storey dwellings in such close proximity would result in direct overlooking into our bedroom and upper living areas, completely destroying our privacy.
- Our natural lighting would be replaced by an intrusive build, creating an oppressive and overbearing wall of development immediately adjacent to our home. The loss of light and sense of enclosure would significantly diminish our living conditions.
- Street lighting is limited, making conditions even more hazardous in low light.
- Steep gradients and icy conditions in winter make access difficult; additional traffic would exacerbate these hazards.

Green Belt and River Valley conflicts

- The site lies within Green Belt land and forms part of a river valley landscape. River Valley Policy OL5/2 on Development in River Valleys resists change of use in such locations. The proposal, as described in Section 5.1 of the Planning Statement, would result in a material change of use and urban encroachment into open land.

Ecology

- The land is the habitat of wildlife including deer, birds, badgers & foxes. Any development will upset the ecological balance of the area.

Planning policy

- Conflict with established planning policy - While the applicant claims this proposal would assist the borough's housing shortfall, this must be considered in context. Around 600 dwellings are already approved at the East Lancs Paper Mill site within 0.2 miles, and a further 3,500 are proposed at the Elton Reservoir site within 0.7 miles. The addition of 9 dwellings would make only a negligible contribution to supply
- Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF states permission should only be granted where adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Here, the minimal housing benefit is clearly outweighed by severe local harm, particularly in terms of highway safety, constrained and potentially unlawful access, residential amenity impacts and cumulative overdevelopment. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF also requires refusal where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, which is evident in this case.

Other

- Holcombe Grove development has won awards for design. Designated a good place to live and bring up families, children have the freedom to play safely in the open air. This will be destroyed if any plans are granted that increase traffic.
- Raises concerns regarding infrastructure and servicing, as any new dwellings would need to connect into existing service media serving neighbouring properties, with no clear evidence that sufficient capacity exists or that impacts on existing residents can be avoided.
- Similar applications for this site have been rejected. The core constraints-specifically regarding access and proximity-have not changed. The reasons for previous refusals remain valid.
- There are covenants in place to only allow farming equipment into this land.
- Steep and challenging topography,
- Construction activities including excavation, piling and landscaping would produce dust and dirt negatively impacting on property and land.

One comment

Incorrect red edge location plan submitted.

The applicant has since rectified this with a revised location plan.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Object and recommend refusal

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Recommend conditions at the Technical Details Stage

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objection in principle.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objection subject to condition.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No objection subject to a condition for the submission of a drainage scheme.

Environmental Health - Pollution Control - No comments to make

Waste Management - No response received.

Transport for Greater Manchester - 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
EN6/4	Wildlife Links and Corridors
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
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-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S5	Clean Air
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 up to 9 dwellings. Consideration of PiP applications are limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

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

The site benefits from an extant consent for a PiP for a development of up to 9 dwellings. However, there have been changes in planning policies including the introduction of Places for everyone and changes to the NPPF.

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

The site is designated as River Valley under UDP Policy OL5/2 and within a Wildlife Corridor under UDP Policy EN6/4.

River Valley

Policy OL5/2 states that within the River Valleys, new buildings or the change of use of existing buildings or the change of use of land will not be permitted. The only exceptions considered acceptable will be those where the development would not lead to the division

of the open parts of the valleys into sections and it falls within the terms below:

- a) where the area is designated as Green Belt the established Green Belt policies will apply; or
- b) where the area does not form part of the Green Belt, at least one of the following circumstances is met:
 - i. that the development represents limited infilling to an established valley settlement or industrial area;
 - ii. that it is an extension to, or renewal of an existing industry, where the economic and employment factors are of overriding importance;
 - iii. that the development is required in association with an outdoor recreation or appropriate tourist facility;
 - iv. that the development is limited and will form part of, and be essential to, the maintenance of the provision and improvement of public services and utilities;
 - v. any other development that would be appropriate in the Green Belt.

The proposed development of 9 dwellings would not meet the first four circumstances permitted under Policy OL5/2. With regard to the fifth circumstance, an assessment of the site against Green Belt policy has been undertaken below.

As confirmed by the previous application (69420), the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions within NPPF paragraph 154.

Since the former application, the NPPF has been amended with the addition of Paragraph 155. This paragraph states that the development of homes should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- 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 the NPPF; 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."

As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to the following purposes:

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

The site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

- Purpose A – to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - The site is located within Radcliffe, between Milntown Street to the north, Holcombe Grove to the south, the Metrolink tram line to the west, and the River Irwell to the east. The site does not contribute strongly to checking the unrestricted sprawl of Radcliffe as it is adjacent to existing development and is largely enclosed by existing development. Therefore, it is considered that the site makes a limited contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- Purpose B - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another - The site is not considered to play an essential role in maintaining the gap between Radcliffe

and Whitefield. The proposed development would not significantly erode the visual separation between the two towns and its location adjacent to existing housing means it is largely contained by built form. As such, it is considered that this site makes no contribution toward preventing the merging of neighbouring towns.

River Valley Conclusion

As the site does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (d), the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt land (with the exception of actually being designated as Green Belt). 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 - It is considered that the development of the site in principle 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 - 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 - The site is located approximately 500m (a 10-minute walk) from Radcliffe town centre. As such, it is considered that the site is in a sustainable location in principle. However, technical details should demonstrate how sustainable transport modes will be prioritised and how safe and suitable access to the site will be achieved & promoted through the development.

It is therefore considered that that the proposal would be appropriate development within the Green Belt and therefore the principle of the proposed development is not in conflict with UDP Policy OL5/2.

Housing Land Supply and Principle of Residential Development

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 is an assessment of potential sites for residential development and is used to assess the housing land supply. It includes sites that have an extant planning permission, sites allocated through the joint Places for Everyone Plan 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 Council has carried out an assessment of the housing land supply to determine whether sites meet the deliverability tests in the NPPF and can contribute to the five year supply of housing land. Based on the 2025 5-year supply statement, the Council has demonstrated a 4.3 year supply of housing land. This includes a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) and accounts for past oversupply when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement. The Council is therefore currently unable to demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing land against the adopted 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 considered 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%.

The five year supply position and the housing delivery test result need to be treated as material factors when determining applications for residential development.

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 lack of five year supply and the latest published HDT result, the 'tilted balance' set out in NPPF paragraph 11(d) 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, being close to the urban area and sitting outside the Green Belt. Similar sites are being released across the country to help meet local housing needs and appeal decisions for similar land designations to River Valley tend to favour their release. River Valley sites can contribute towards meeting local housing needs and help to protect the Green Belt.

On balance, therefore, the principle of residential development on this River Valley site is considered to be acceptable given its sustainable location and the contribution that it would have to meeting local housing needs. The adverse impacts of developing this site are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. The national requirement to significantly boost the supply of housing under the NPPF is a material consideration that would favour the release of this site in principle, subject to detail.

Housing

Type, Size and Design of New Housing

PfE Policy JP-H3 – Seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes. All new dwellings must 1. comply with the nationally described space standards and 2. be built to the 'accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. This will need to be addressed at Technical Details stage.

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 70 dwellings per hectare applies, because the site is within 400 metres of Radcliffe town centre.

The site covers an area of approximately 0.4 hectares, so 9 dwellings would equate to 23 dwellings per hectare, which would not comply with Policy JP-H4. Development of 0.4 hectares at 70 dwellings per hectare would equate to 28 dwellings. No information is provided on the net developable area of the site, so by necessity the density assessment is based on the whole of the site. However, in order to meet the PfE density policy, the net developable area would need to equate to only one third of the total site area.

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

The applicant has not submitted any justification for the lower density as part of their planning application.

The previous application (69420) was approved prior to the adoption of PfE, although the emerging policy was considered. Comments were based on the 50 dwelling per hectare requirement within 800m of the metrolink stop, however following adoption of the plan, it has since become clear that the site is within an area where a density of 70dph applies, as it is within 400m of Radcliffe Town Centre. At the time of the previous application, although the density was below the density set out in Policy JP-H4 it was considered that the proposed density would be acceptable given the site's location within the river valley policy designation.

As an adopted policy, PfE policy JP-H4 has greater weight than it did at the time of determination of the previous application. The proposed density is considerably lower than the PfE policy requirement.

The Government's Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) on Planning Reform: Next Phase made on 16 December 2025 proposes a minimum density of 50 dwellings per hectare around 'well-connected' stations – maximising opportunities for sustainable development, making the most of high levels of connectivity, and improving access to jobs and services. Radcliffe tram stop is considered to be a well connected station, and is less than 500m of the site (as the crow flies – the walking / cycling route would be longer).

The WMS emphasises the importance of delivering higher density development in sustainable locations and sets a clear expectation for authorities to set minimum densities

in well-connected locations, including around train stations and town centres. This site is considered to be a well-connected location, due to the proximity of the town centre and the availability of public transport. The proposal for 9 dwellings is below both the 50dph referenced in the WMS and the adopted development plan policy set out in PfE Policy JP-H4 of 70 dwellings per hectare in this location.

The site's river valley and wildlife corridor status does not automatically justify a lower density, and the applicant's planning statement doesn't provide a clear justification for a lower density. The site's status as a wildlife corridor may contribute to a justification for a lower density, due to the impact on green infrastructure and possible need to mitigate impacts on the wildlife corridor, but equally, the site could be developed at higher density with smaller units without increasing the impact on Green Infrastructure. As this is a PiP application, there is insufficient information to assess the impact.

Developing the site for 9 dwellings would therefore be contrary to JP-H4 and NPPF paragraph 130 which expects development to make efficient use of land.

Wildlife Corridor

Policy EN6/4 states that wildlife corridors should be consolidated and where appropriate, strengthened. Furthermore, the policy states that development which would adversely affect wildlife corridors will not be permitted. Any new development within or adjacent to wildlife corridors should contribute to their effectiveness by way of design, landscaping and siting of the proposals, along with mitigation works.

The principle of developing the site would conflict with the aim to consolidate and strengthen the wildlife corridors in this area, and would adversely affect the corridor, however due to the nature of the application, it is unclear as to whether the development would provide mitigation, contribute to the effectiveness of the wildlife corridor through landscaping, design, and siting. As such, the principle of the proposed development is in conflict with UDP Policy EN6/4.

Planning Obligations

This proposal is for 9 dwellings, which would not ordinarily require contributions for recreation or affordable housing. However, the adjoining land already has Permission in Principle for up to 9 dwellings (70334), and this application appears to be a subdivision of the wider site. This site would require access through the adjoining site and the two sites are in single ownership.

As set out in SPG5 (para. 2.5) the Council will seek to avoid situations whereby the landowner / developer attempts to subdivide the site to avoid meeting their obligations.

The requirement for planning obligations for the aggregated wider site (specifically affordable housing, recreation and potential education contributions) will need to be addressed at the technical details consent stage.

Consultee comments

Highways

The Local Highway Authority would not support the development for the following reason -

The proposal and cumulative pedestrian and vehicle traffic generated would result in the intensification of use of the unadopted site access (Holcombe Grove) that is substandard in terms of pedestrian facilities, widths and forward visibility for the number of dwellings now proposed to be served, significantly in excess of the original highway design parameters, which is likely to lead to pedestrian and vehicular conflicts on the access road and at the junction of Holcombe Grove with New Road to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road and pedestrian safety.

Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)

The location of the proposed development has sufficiently lateral separation from Metrolink that there are no comments to make from a Metrolink perspective in respect of this application.

Drainage - United Utilities

United Utilities have been consulted on the application and would recommend the following condition -

Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:

- (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water;
- (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);
- (iii) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
- (iv) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable; and
- (v) Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems.

The approved schemes shall be in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) or any subsequent replacement national standards.

Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.

Local Lead Flood Authority response

No objection in principle subject to the following condition:

Development shall not commence until details of surface water drainage proposals have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must be based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance and be designed in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or subsequent revisions of it. This must include assessment of potential SuDS options for surface water drainage with appropriate calculations and test results to support the chosen solution. Design details should comply with guidance contained in the Greater Manchester's Sustainable Drainage Design Guide, March 25. Details of proposed maintenance arrangements should also be provided

Reason. To promote sustainable development. The current application contains insufficient information regarding the proposed drainage scheme to fully assess the impact.

Ecology - GMEU response

GMEU have been consulted and have not identified any new ecological reasons why permission in principle could not be granted.

the following information would be expected as part of Technical Details -

- A preliminary ecological appraisal,
- A badger assessment and survey and
- A biodiversity net gain assessment.

Environmental Health - Contaminated land

Due to the sensitivity of the proposed land use, as a minimum, a Preliminary Risk

Assessment will be required.

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, there is the potential for contamination on this site, therefore, we recommend that the following contaminated land conditions are placed on any grant of permission:

- Site characterisation & risk assessment
- Remediation strategy & verification plan
- Remediation & verification

Reason: To prevent unacceptable risk to Human Health and Controlled Waters and to prevent pollution of the environment in accordance with the aims and Paragraphs 187(f), 196 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

If permission is granted, in order for this Section to be satisfied that this development does not pose a risk to human health or the environment, the following information needs to be submitted to the Council for approval:

- (i) A preliminary risk assessment.
- (ii) A site investigation and risk assessment report.
- (iii) A detailed remediation strategy and validation plan.
- (iv) A materials management plan, if the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste Code of Practice is to be used.
- (v) After completion of site works, a verification report is required to validate that the work undertaken conforms to the remediation proposals received and agreed by this Section.

Environmental Health -Air Quality

The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Due to the scale of the development, it is considered unlikely that the development would create an increase of more than 500 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the Planning Practice Guidance-Air Quality and 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), this Section recommends the following condition to be placed on any grant of permission:

Prior to occupation the applicant shall provide:

{Residential less than 10 parking spaces}

1 no. electric vehicle (EV) charging point (minimum 7kW*) per dwelling/parking space.

{Residential more than 10 parking spaces additional point to be added}

Cable routes to be provided for all parking spaces which do not have access to an electric vehicle charging point.

Certification and photographic evidence of the installation of the agreed electric vehicle charge points shall 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.

*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>.

Reason. To encourage the uptake of ultra-low emission vehicles and ensure the development is sustainable and to safeguard residential amenity, public health and quality of life with respect to Local Air Quality, in accordance with paragraphs 112e, 117e, 187e and 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and Places for Everyone Policy JP-S5 (Clean Air).

If permission is granted, the following information will be required:

- (i) Details of the proposed EV charging points to be installed including the information sheet detailing the make and model, to demonstrate that they meet the required specification.
- (ii) Evidence of the installation of the chosen EV charging points, such as photographs

Response to objections

Issues relating to traffic generation, access to the site, impacts on amenity and ecology issues are not relevant considerations under a PiP application. These details would be considered at the Technical Details stage.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

The proposed development for 9 no dwellings on a 0.4 hectare 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.

<u>Case Officer</u> JT 4/3/26	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u> DM 04.03.2026	<u>Date</u>
----------------------------------	-------------	--	-------------