

Daylight and Shadow Assessment

Plot 1 – Former Ambulance Station Cemetery Road, Ramsbottom, BL0 9PU

Document Control

Author: Planning Consultant

Client: Home Park Avenue Ltd

Revision: Rev A

Date: 22 December 2025

Local Planning Authority: Bury Council

1. Introduction and Scope

This Daylight and Shadow Assessment has been prepared in support of a full planning application for the redevelopment of the Former Ambulance Station, Cemetery Road, Ramsbottom. The assessment relates specifically to Plot 1 and considers potential effects on the closest neighbouring property, No. 29.

2. Drawings and Information Used

This assessment is based on Proposed Site Layout Drawing P009 and Proposed Street Elevations Drawing P008. North is located at the top of Drawing P009.

3. Site Context and Receptor

Plot 1 is located on the western part of the site. The closest residential receptor is No. 29, located immediately to the west / north-west of Plot 1.

4. Building Heights

Plot 1 has a ridge height of 175.727 m AOD and a ground floor level of 166.210 m AOD. The adjacent dwelling at No. 29 has a ridge height of 175.610 m AOD and an eaves height of 173.180 m AOD. Plot 1 is therefore approximately 0.12 m higher at ridge than No. 29.

5. Sun Path and Shadow Behaviour

With north at the top of the page, shadows from Plot 1 would be expected to fall primarily to the west in the morning, north at midday, and east in the afternoon. The period of greatest potential effect on No. 29 would therefore be during early morning hours.

6. Likely Daylight and Sunlight Effects

Given the comparable ridge heights and domestic scale of the development, Plot 1 is not considered to introduce a materially taller or overbearing form. Any additional overshadowing of No. 29 would be limited and largely confined to typical seasonal patterns, with winter effects being less significant in planning terms.

7. Conclusion

Based on the siting shown on Drawing P009 and the heights confirmed on Drawing P008, Plot 1 is unlikely to result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to No. 29. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in daylight and shadow terms.