

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 17/07/2025	Ref: 71819/FUL
Registration: 22/05/2025	LDfC: 19/06/2025	Expiry Date: 17/07/2025
Site Visit:	Site Notice: 28/05/2025	Press Date: 05/06/2025
Objections: 1	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: ARW
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Variation of condition no. 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 68661 to alter the approved design/layout of the house to include a new basement level, 2no. rear dormers swapped for 2no. rear outriggers; addition of 2no. single storey side extensions and an increase in floorspace

Location: Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 5PT

Description

The site relates to a plot and building which forms part of the former Ainsworth Nursing Home. It is accessed via a private lane which is formed from the top of Ainsworth Road. The whole site is located in the Green Belt, Special Landscape Area and West Pennine Moors and is on the Council's Draft local list as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The site is covered by a blanket TPO.

The site is located to the north of Ainsworth Village and is self-contained and remote from the rest of the village, nearby farm settlements and residential dwellings, having formally being an isolation hospital for infectious diseases. It was later used as a nursing home for the elderly up until the time it closed down.

The nursing home site is rectangular in shape and the existing built development is generally focused centrally within the site, with the main internal access running north through the site which branches to the east to serve the main building and other buildings to the north. The remaining land is grassed, treed or vegetated. Surrounding the site is open land and fields.

By way of background, the site has now been sold off as separate plots and three plots have planning permission for the conversion to residential dwellings with alterations and extensions.

This application relates to a plot of land to the southwest of the former Ainsworth nursing home site. The site contains a small brick building, which was in use as a gatehouse. The remainder of the site is open and there are trees on the perimeter.

Planning permission was granted for the erection of a single dwelling and the conversion of the gatehouse into living accommodation. The proposed dwelling would be two storeys at the front and single storey with dormers at the rear. The dwelling would be constructed from brick with a slate roof and would be accessed via the existing access.

The proposed development involves the variation of the approved plans condition to change the house type from a bungalow with dormers on the rear elevation to a two storey dwelling with side extensions and a basement.

The access to the dwelling would not be changed.

Relevant Planning History

67342 - Erection of two dwellings and associated access, parking and landscaping, provision of landscape buffer; Change of use and refurbishment of Gate House within the curtilage of the former Ainsworth Nursing Home at former Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Withdrawn - 11 July 2022

68661 - Erection of a dwelling and associated access, parking and landscaping, provision of landscape buffer, and change of use and refurbishment of Gate House within the curtilage of the former Ainsworth Nursing Home - Approve with Conditions 10/11/2022

Adjacent site

65412 - Conversion of wash house to 1 no. dwelling with single storey extensions and dormer to rear at Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 22 June 2020.

65626 - Conversion of property to 1 no. residential building; increase to the roof height, two storey extension and associated parking and landscaping, change of use of land to residential garden at the bungalow, Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 23 September 2020.

66142 - Change of use from nursing home to private dwelling including alterations and garage extension at Knowsley House, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 21 January 2021.

66398 - Non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 65412 - Removal of two windows on the west elevation and replace with timber French doors at Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 5 February 2021.

66467 - Variation of conditions following approval of 65626- Amendment to approved plans with the addition of a porch at the bungalow, Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 29 March 2021

66763 - Demolition of existing nursing home and construction of two storey detached dwelling with associated garages at Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Refused - 9 December 2021.

66836 - Demolition of the building known as 'The Haven', and the erection of a replacement building for use as a private dwellinghouse, with associated garden curtilage and parking at the Haven, part of the former Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 22 July 2021.

67368 - Demolition of existing building to be replaced with 2 no. dwellings at the Coach House, former Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Refused - 10 January 2023. Appeal dismissed - 10 January 2023.

68665 - Demolition and conversion of the building known as 'The Haven' to 1 no. private residential dwelling, with associated garden curtilage and parking at 5 Knowsley View, The Haven, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 9 November 2022.

68792 - Detached garage to side of existing property at the Old Wash House, 2 Knowsley View, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 8 December 2022.

69616 - Demolition of existing building to be replaced with 2 no. dwellings at the Coach House, former Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Refused - 24 August 2023. Appeal dismissed - 15 July 2024.

69713 - First floor side/rear extension at the Bungalow, 7 Knowsley View, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 3 August 2023.

69975 - Removal of condition 6 (removed permitted development rights) on planning permission ref. 66467 at the Bungalow, Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Refused - 19 October 2023

70163 - Prior approval for proposed agricultural building at land to south of former Ainsworth Nursing Home, Knowsley Road, Ainsworth. Prior approval required and refused - 4 December 2023. Appeal dismissed - 22 July 2024.

70880 - Erection of 1.85m high electric gates at front and 1.85m high gates / fencing to garage driveway at Old Wash House, 2 Knowsley View, Ainsworth. Approved with conditions - 1 October 2024.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 23 May 2025 and a press notice was published in the Bury Times on 5 June 2025. Site notices were posted on 28 May 2025.

1 letter has been received, which has raised the following issues:

- The proposal would negatively impact upon the character of the area and residential amenity.
- The streetscene drawing (east/west) is out of date and misleading. The building 'administrator block' is still shown with a conservatory on the west. This has been demolished and replaced with a more solid structure and is used as a lounge.
- The proposed development would reduce the ability to see open green belt from the west facing windows in the lounge, utility/kitchen and from the patio doors.
- The response to previous applications from the Council have focused on the visibility of the NDHA from outside the site. The side extensions will impact visibility into the site and give the administrator block a lesser view of the green belt.
- The proposed side extensions and positioning of waste bins and cycle shed will increase the loss of openness within the site and impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
- It is not clear how large the cycle shed will be.
- The original Decision Notice (for 68661) to allow the build was approved as the design would not detract from the heritage value of the existing buildings. The alteration to the plans in this application are significant. In addition to the rear and side extensions the half circle arch in the new build has been ditched. This would have mirrored what is found in the existing Gate House, Coach House and the administrator block, which all retain their half circle arches at the front. The majority of windows for the newly proposed build now lack the vertical emphasis found in the windows of the original builds.
- Impact upon existing properties by the digging out of the basement. The access way is used by all properties and must not be blocked. Concern that my property will be damaged during construction.
- What are the plans for the original gatehouse building?
- The planning statement states that the siting of the dwelling would be the same save for relatively small extensions. The drawing in the planning statement is 3551.02 but the submitted plan is 3551.09 and these layouts are different. the proposed house is shown several metres south of its approved position, which would have an adverse impact upon the lounge to my property.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No objections, subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to construction traffic management plan, dilapidation survey, sprinkler system, car parking and turning facilities.

Public Rights of Way Officer -

Conservation Officer - Object - Design, size, scale and mass of proposed dwelling would dominate and erode the significance of the non-designated heritage asset site.

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
EN1/3	Landscaping Provision
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN8/1	Tree Preservation Orders
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
OL1/3	Infilling in Existing Villages in the Green Belt
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
HT6/2	Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
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 - Green Belt) - The application site falls within the Green Belt as designated under PpE 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 one of the following exceptions applies:

- a. buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b. the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c. the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d. the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e. limited infilling in villages;
- f. limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g. limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- h. Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
 - i. mineral extraction;
 - ii. engineering operations;
 - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt

- location;
- iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
- v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
- vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Planning permission was granted for a dwelling on this site as an infill development. The proposed development involves changes to the design of the proposed dwelling, which include the addition of a basement, side extensions and a change from dormers at first floor level to a full first floor. The planning statement acknowledges that the floorspace of the proposed dwelling would increase but does not provide any floorspace or volume figures for the proposed basement. In addition, the statement does not assess the impact upon the openness of the Green Belt, except to state that the proposed basement would not increase the loss of openness. As such, there is insufficient information to assess the impact of the proposed development upon the character and openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy OL1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the NPPF.

Principle - Residential - The principle of residential development on this site was established with the grant of planning consent in November 2022. As such, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy H1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Heritage, design and layout - The appeal site comprises part of the former Ainsworth Nursing Home complex, located just off Knowsley Road on the outskirts of Ainsworth. Together with a number of other structures on the wider complex, it was developed in the early 20th century as part of Ainsworth Hospital for the treatment of smallpox. When the nursing home use ceased, the site was sold as separate plots and a number of these former hospital buildings have been converted to residential use, including The Wash House, The Haven and the Bungalow and the Administrative Block (also known as Knowsley House). The building known as the Coach House has been the subject of two applications, which were refused and the subsequent appeals dismissed.

The group of buildings at Ainsworth Nursing Home is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). The significance of these buildings individually derives from their architectural interest and associations with a locally renown architect, Henry Lord. Significance comes from the former use and function of the wider hospital complex and evidences the evolution of health and social care as a pre-cursor to the later creation of the welfare state and the National Health Service. Some of the other buildings have more architectural interest and detailing than others which contribute greater aesthetic value. Significance also comes from the buildings' group value, being a remnant of former hospital structures, with functional and associative links. Consequently, the wider former hospital site forms the setting for the designated heritage assets and each surviving structure within this contributes to the significance of the designated heritage assets therein.

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.

Paragraph 208 states Local Planning Authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by

development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Paragraph 210 states in determining applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of:

- a. the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b. the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c. the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The design of the previously approved dwelling was carefully considered to ensure that it complemented the design of the existing buildings on site and contributed to the group value of the buildings. Various details, such as the arched door opening, brick headers, stone cills and dormers on the rear elevation, were derived from the adjacent gatehouse and other buildings within the site, to ensure that the proposed dwelling complemented the gatehouse and the wider site.

The heritage statement and planning statement submitted with the application describe the scheme as including additional rear outriggers, which is different to the plans submitted and does not describe the impact of the proposed changes upon the significance of the NDHA.

The proposed changes would increase the size, scale and mass of the dwelling, by virtue of the added floorspace, the height increase to two storeys and a reduction in the hips of the roof. This would visually dominate and challenge the existing buildings on site and would harm the historic significance of the site. This is an issue that an Inspector considered as part of the recent appeal for the Coach House. The proposal involved the demolition of the existing building and the erection of 2 four bedroom detached dwellings.

The Inspector considered there to be a 'clear hierarchy of buildings that remains today' and was concerned that the proposed 4 bedroomed dwelling would compete with Knowsley House, which was historically the key building on the hospital site. The Inspector concluded that the,

'Introduction of two large detached dwellings as proposed, would erode the balance (of the hierarchy of buildings on site) and undermine the integrity of the overall site. The scale, form, design and overall appearance of the former hospital, they would not sit comfortably within the wider setting of the heritage asset and would do little to respect its relevance and significance.'

The proposed dwelling would be located opposite Knowsley House and in the absence of a heritage statement, it is considered that the proposed development would also challenge Knowsley House and therefore, the hierarchy of buildings and the integrity of the site.

The additional larger dormer on the rear elevation would further dominate visually and as such, harm the significance of the site. The addition in number and the increase of the size of the bi-fold/patio doors on the rear elevation would be an overly contemporising feature, which would impact negatively. The removal of the brick headers at first floor level at the front and rear and the re-design of the main entrance to the front elevation from a high brick arch with keystone referencing the Gate House and Knowsley House would further erode the significance of the NDHA site.

As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the character and significance of NDHA and would conflict with Policies JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the NPPF.

Insufficient information - There are a number of plans, which conflict with each other or do not provide the required information. The proposed basement has been included on the proposed floor plans, but it has not been labelled as to what use this room would have. In addition, there are no walls within this space, which occupies the whole ground floor of the dwelling. As such, it is not possible to assess what the impact of the proposed basement would have on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The proposed elevation plans contain conflicting information and also conflict with the proposed floor plans.

The proposed front elevation plan shows a single storey extension to the north with a small lean to extension, where as on the rear elevation plan, this is shown as a wider single storey extension with a hipped roof.

The height of the proposed dwelling is different on the proposed front and rear elevation plans. On the front, the proposed dwelling would be 7.1 metres and would measure 8.2 metres on the rear. The height of the proposed single storey extension varies on the front and rear elevation plans. On the front, it measures 6 metres and measures 6.2 metres on the rear.

The proposed streetscene plan is inaccurate. The central building, known as the Haven, has been redeveloped and a new dwelling constructed - the plan shows the original building. Knowsley House (also known as the Administration building) has been converted into a dwelling and the conservatory shown on the streetscene plan has been replaced with an extension.

No floor plans or elevation plans have been provided of the proposed cycle store and bin store, which are located to the south of the proposed dwelling.

Finally, the planning statement describes a dwelling of a different design to the plans, which were submitted. The statement refers to a dwelling with three, two storey outriggers at the rear and the proposed plans show a two storey rear elevation with no outriggers.

Therefore, the plans contain insufficient and conflicting information and it is not possible to fully assess the impact of the proposal upon the wider area and the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

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

There would be 20.2 metres from the study for the proposed dwelling to the lounge associated with Knowsley House, which would be in excess of the 13 metres required.

The bulk of the proposed dwelling would be set behind the building line for the Wash House. There would be 12.6 metres from the blank gable of the proposed dwelling (single storey with a dormer at first floor level to the front elevation of the Wash House, which would comply with the aspect standards.

There would be between 10.3 and 19.9 metres from the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling to the boundary with the site, which would be in excess of the 7 metres required.

Therefore, the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Trees - All of the trees within the former Ainsworth Nursing Home site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

The proposed development would involve the addition of a basement, which would be

located on the root protection area for tree T6, which is to be retained. The proposed dwelling would be located within 8.7 metres from the trunk of the tree and as such, it is likely that the digging of the basement would impact upon the root system and therefore, retention of the tree.

In addition, the proposed parking spaces would need to be increased in width and depth to comply with the parking standards (see parking section), which would impact upon the root protection area of T5, which is shown to be retained.

No tree survey has been submitted and no information has been submitted to explain what impact the proposed basement would have on the retention of the trees. Therefore, there is insufficient information and the proposed development would be in conflict with Policy EN8/1 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-G7 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Highways issues - The access arrangements to the proposed dwelling would not be amended and the Traffic Section has no objections to the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety and would be in accordance with Policy H2/1 and H2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Parking - SPD11 states that the parking standards for a 5 bedroom house would be 3 spaces. In addition, an EV charger must be provided and covered cycle storage for 5 cycles is required.

The proposed site plan indicates that 3 parking spaces would be provided. However, these spaces would be 2.4 metres by 4.8 metres and the SPD requires parking spaces to be 2.5 metre by 5 metres. As such, the proposed parking spaces would not be acceptable.

A cycle store would be located to the south of the proposed dwelling and would measure 0.5 metres by 1.9 metres. This would not be large enough to accommodate 5 cycles. In addition, no floor plans or elevation plans have been provided and it is not known if this would be a covered store.

The proposed site plan indicated that two EV charging points would be provided - one adjacent to the parking area and one on the front elevation of the proposed dwelling. Whilst one of the proposed chargers would be remote from the parking area, it is noted that 1 EV charger is required and as such, this would be acceptable. The proposed charger would be secured via a condition.

Therefore, the proposed development would fail to provide the necessary level of parking and cycle storage and would conflict with Policy HT2/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD 11.

Revised plans - The agent has requested that an extension of time is agreed and submitted revised plans. No pre-application enquiry was submitted for this proposal. It is considered that there would need to be significant changes to the plans and information submitted to enable the application to be supported. It is considered that these changes would be so significant that a new application would be required. In addition, the revised plans submitted would not address all of the concerns raised with the agent. As such, the revised plans have not been accepted and the application has been determined on the plans and information submitted.

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 application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to enable the impact of the proposed development upon the Green Belt to be properly assessed. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy OL1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development by virtue of its design, appearance and scale would introduce discordant, disproportionate and inharmonious features and would have a significantly harmful impact on the historic significance of the Non-Designated Heritage Asset and openness and character of the Built Environment and as such the proposed development would be contrary to the principles in chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the NPPF, Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-P2 - Heritage of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 3 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient and conflicting information in relation to the proposed side extensions, the height of the main dwelling and the proposed side extension and the use of the proposed basement to enable the impact upon the design and the impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties to be properly assessed. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-P2 - Heritage of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 4 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to enable the design of the proposed bin store and cycle store to be properly assessed. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-P2 - Heritage of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 5 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to enable the impact of the proposed basement extension upon the protected trees within the site to be properly assessed. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy EN8/1 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Policy JP-G7 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 6 There is insufficient cycle storage provided within the site to comply with the Council's parking standards in respect of the proposed development. In addition, the proposed parking spaces would not be of sufficient size to comply with size specified in SPD11. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy HT2/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 11 - Parking Standards in Bury, June 2025.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HL - 17/07/2025			

