

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 22/06/2026	Ref: 73058/FUL
Registration: 07/05/2026	LDfC: 05/06/2026	Expiry Date: 02/07/2026
Site Visit: 14/05/2026	Site Notice: 14/05/2026	Press Date: 14/05/2026
Objections: 0	Con Area: RAMS	Adv Type: CA
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA Dec Level: DEL Stat Class: COUS

Proposal: Change of use from veterinary practice (Class E) to 2 no. self contained commercial units ground floor (Class E) and 1 no. 1 bedroom and 1 no. 2 bedroom apartments first floor (Class C3); External alterations to recover roof, installation of 7 no. rooflights to front elevation, rear dormer, render & cladding

Location: 19 Central Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9AF

Description

The application relates to an 1.5 storey property located at the end of a terrace. The premises currently has accommodation within the roof space with two pitched roof dormers located on the rear elevation. The premises is stone built, with former entrances converted to windows at ground floor level. To the side of the premises there is a stone sett area that appears to be utilised for parking. The stone setts continue to the rear of the property located within a gated yard.

The site is located within Ramsbottom Conservation Area, and to the west of the boundary of Ramsbottom's main shopping area.

Planning permission is sought for the change of use from veterinary practice (Class E) to 2 no. self contained commercial units ground floor (Class E) and 1 no. 1 bedroom and 1 no. 2 bedroom apartments first floor (Class C3); External alterations to recover roof, installation of 7 no. rooflights to front elevation, rear dormer, render & cladding

Relevant Planning History

16406 - Change of use light industry to veterinary surgery (former housing maintenance depot) - Approve 15/11/1984

17242 - Change of use of first floor from storage to flat - Approve 25/07/1985

Publicity

Neighbour letters 08/05/2026
Site Notice 14/05/2026
Press Notice 14/05/2026

No representations received

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No formal recommendation received. Concerns raised in relation to lack of parking, the missing footway to the westerly side of Central Street, opening of windows into the highway, and bin storage.

Conservation Officer The proposed alterations would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and as such would represent less than substantial harm and although there would be some public benefit in the provision of

additional housing, and occupation of a currently vacant building it would not outweigh the harm identified to the NDHA or the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Environmental Health - Pollution Control - Insufficient information has been provided by the applicant in relation to noise.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - no response

Drainage Section - SuDs condition requested

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No response

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
S1/2	Shopping in Other Town Centres
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/3	Water Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
H2/4	Conversions
H3/1	Assessing Non-Conforming Uses
H3/2	Existing Incompatible Uses
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
JP-C1	Our Integrated Network
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C3	Our Public Transport
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-P6	Health
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury

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 (E Use)

The Site is located just outside of the Ramsbottom Main Shopping Area as allocated under UDP Policy S/12 with the boundary of this allocation running across the front of the site.

The existing building is in Class E use, and as such no objections are raised in principle to the subdivision of the ground floor into 2no. separate Class E units.

Principle (Residential)

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.

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%.

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.

This means that 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 located within an established urban area, outside of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

Heritage

The application site is a listed building and within Ramsbottom Conservation Area. As the site is located within the Conservation Area it is necessary to consider the proposal in terms of UDP Policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control of the UDP in that the Council will take action as appropriate to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas. PfE Policy JP-P2 - Heritage also applies, and ensures that the LPA will work proactively to conserve, sustain and enhance our historic environment.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities in the exercise of their planning functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Ramsbottom is a good example of a northern mill town in the higher reaches of the River Irwell valley with topographical character and the vernacular materials and design of its built form born from the underlying geology of the area being in carboniferous sandstone.

The built form in the lower parts of the town centre is predominantly two storey interspersed with single storey development constructed from local stone, in a linear layout with uniform size and scale. It is these features that create the special distinctiveness and character of the conservation area which requires special consideration to its protection when considering development affecting this distinctiveness and its setting.

The application site is within Ramsbottom conservation area and is part of a short row on Central Street to the west of Bolton Street. The row comprises the application site, originally the fire engine station, latterly a veterinary practice and the British Legion Club. The row is two and single storey constructed from local stone with slate roofs and makes a strong positive contribution to the special distinctiveness, character and appearance of the conservation area. The building itself fronts Central Street, and presently has yard areas to the side and rear made up of stone setts. The land to the rear of the site slopes steeply with a retaining wall located to the rear of the site, and steps to the south leading to Rothwell Street.

The former fire engine station dates from the late 19th century or early 20th century and is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). It is a rare building typology in the borough and as such has strong local heritage value. Whilst the Heritage Statement does consider that the building is an NDHA there is no detailed assessment of how the applicant has reached this conclusion and the former use of the site as a fire engine station has not been acknowledged.

The short row is largely unaltered and is a good example of the vernacular architecture, simple form and function of a Lancashire mill town, which do not include rooflights as an historic architectural feature. The existing building has concrete roof tiles which would not be historical. It appears the slate roof was removed and replaced some time between 2009 and 2018. This also included the removal of 3no. roof lights.

The proposal seeks to add 7no. rooflights to the front elevation. It is considered that the number of rooflights proposed would represent an incongruous architectural feature on the building which would have wider views in that part of the conservation area from Rothwell Street, Central Street and Callender Street. There is no historicism in the addition of rooflights in this part of the conservation area. It is noted that there are rooflights within the conservation area which either pre-date the Ramsbottom Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and the NPPF or have been inserted without planning permission and are now immune from planning enforcement.

The front glazing proposed at ground floor would serve the Class E uses. The glazing proposed would largely remove the existing wooden panelling which detracts from this frontage and would allow the scale of the former doors associated with the fire engine station to be appreciated. The use of UPVC for these replacement windows however would not be acceptable. UPVC frames are generally bulkier in style and as very limited details of the design of the windows have been submitted the LPA are unable to make a full assessment of the harm these windows may represent.

Due to the changes in levels, and the steps to the south of the site that lead from Callender Street, via Rothwell Street to Central Street, the rear roof slope of the site is highly visible. The proposed flat roof dormer would cause harm to the architectural significance of the NDHA and be a negative feature within the conservation area. It would represent an alien feature with no historicism in not being an original feature of the architectural grain of the conservation area being a contemporising feature. Whilst noted that there are flat roof dormers visible within Central Street, the Ramsbottom Conservation Area Management Plan notes that loft conversions that include box structures of significant size have an adverse impact on the conservation area and as such the installation of other dormers within the vicinity of the site should not warrant the introduction of further discordant features.

It is considered that the proposed external alterations to the roof would cause harm to the architectural significance of the NDHA to an unacceptable level.

The proposed alterations to the roof would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and as such would represent less than substantial harm and although there would be some public benefit in the provision of additional housing, and occupation of a currently vacant building it would not outweigh the harm identified to the NDHA or the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The application cannot be supported in heritage conservation terms as it would not comply with or be contrary to paragraphs 212, 215 and 216 of the NPPF and adopted Bury UDP policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control.

Visual Amenity

Density

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. Therefore in accordance with Policy JP-H4 regard should be had to a minimum net residential density of 120 dwellings per hectare at this site. The application form states that the site is 375 square metres or 0.0375 hectares, which based on a total of 2no. dwellings would result in a

density of 53 dwellings per hectare. The proposal would therefore fail to make efficient use of land.

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.

No case has been made by the applicant to justify a lower density at this site.

Residential Internal

PfE Policy JP-H3 also states that all new dwelling must:

1. Comply with the nationally described space standards (NDSS); and
2. Be built to the 'accessible and adaptable' standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The applicant has not provided a supporting document to show that the proposal would comply with NDSS standards, and the floor plans do not provide room areas.

Any area with a headroom of less than 1.5 metres is not counted within the Gross Internal Area (GIA). The section indicates that the proposed dormers would have ahead height of approximately 2.4 metres, and the plans have a hatched green line that appears to show the areas of the roof that is 1500mm high.

Taking this into consideration the GIA of Flat 1 would be approximately 56 square metres. Bedroom 1 is approximately 11.5 square metres and 2. 9 metres wide. Bedroom 2 when measured on the proposed floor plan would be approximately 7.2 square metres and 2.6 metres wide. The in built store measures approximately 1.4 square metres.

The minimum GIA for a 1 storey, 2 bed, 3 person dwelling is 61 square metres, which has not been complied with. Bedroom 2 would not comply with the minimum floor area for a single occupancy room of at least 7.5 square metres. The in built storage would fall below the requirement to provide 2 square metres. Flat 1 would therefore fail to comply with NDSS standards.

The GIA of Flat 2 would be approximately 42 square metres. The bedroom is is approximately 11.5 square metres and 2. 9 metres wide. The in built store measures approximately 0.925 square metres.

The minimum GIA for a 1 storey, 1 bed, 2 person dwelling is 50 square metres, which has not been complied with. The in built storage would fall below the requirement to provide 1.5 square metres. Flat 1 would therefore fail to comply with NDSS standards.

Layout and Design

In addition to the Heritage and Conservation Area Policies set out above UDP Policies H2/1 and H2/2 provide the assessment criteria for detailed matters relating to height, appearance, density and character, aspects and finishing materials for new residential developments. PfE Policy JP-H3 seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes reflecting local plan policies and having regard to relevant local evidence. Development across the plan area should seek to incorporate a range of dwelling types and sizes, including for self-build.

UDP Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that development proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of a particular area. PfE Policy JP-P1 seeks to create a city region that consists of a series of beautiful, healthy and varied places. High quality design is fundamental to achieving this. Policy H2/4 has specific regard to

effects on amenity of neighbouring properties, general character of the area, amenity of occupants, effects from external changes on the street scene and car parking and servicing requirements

The harm of the external alterations has been addressed above when reviewing the impact of the proposal on the Conservation Area and NDHA.

It should also be noted however that the existing and proposed elevations are not accurate. The elevations supplied do not accurately reflect the stone quoin detailing around the openings to the front of the property, fails to include the quoin detailing on the corner of the property. The gap between the window and the attached property at the attached Royal British Legion property is also not reflective of the existing elevation.

An accurate site plan has not been submitted of the site, no details of bin storage, cycle storage, amenity space, location of or sections of the retaining wall have been provided.

These issues will be expanded on further below.

Amenity

UDP Policy H1/2 states that the council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses. Policy H2/4 has specific regard to effects on amenity of neighbouring properties, general character of the area, amenity of occupants, effects from external changes on the street scene and car parking and servicing requirements. There are no adopted aspect standards for new residential properties however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 (SPD6) provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case.

For clarity the following aspect standards would be applicable:

- 20 metres between directly facing habitable room windows;
- 13 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed two storey blank wall
- 6.5 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed single storey blank wall
- 7 metres between a proposed first floor habitable room window and a directly facing boundary with a neighbouring property.

As set out above no section plan has been provided that shows the relationship of the existing retaining wall to the proposed habitable room windows within the proposed dormer. Having been on site the Case Officer can confirm that the height of this wall, is broadly similar to the height of the proposed windows.

The main window for flat 1, relating to the living area would face towards this retaining wall. The proposed rooflights, whilst providing light would have a limited outlook. This window would be located approximately 5 metres from the retaining wall which would be below the 6.5 metres required by SPD 6. It also appears that the distance between the bedroom window for bedroom 2 would be approximately 6.3 metres which again is below the aspect standards required however as the site plan does not show the location of the wall or the dormer windows and no sections have been provided the LPA can not make an accurate assessment in terms of aspect standards to ensure that the future occupiers of either unit would have an acceptable outlook from their principal habitable room windows.

It does not appear that the proposal would provide any access to outdoor amenity space for the future occupiers of the premises.

The front glazing proposed at ground floor would serve the Class E uses and as such would

not represent a loss of privacy in terms of residential amenity.

Noise

UDP Policy H3/1 - Assessing Non-Conforming Uses and H3/2 - Existing Incompatible Uses that consider factors such as noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, grit, dust, visual intrusion, traffic generation and parking arrangements, and hours of operation, and seeks to implement measures to control these where possible to minimise areas of conflict and potential nuisance.

Policy JP-P1 further reinforces this by stating that developments should offer comfortable and inviting indoor and outdoor environments. UDP Policy EN7/2 - Noise Pollution does not permit development which would lead to an unacceptable noise and environmental nuisance to nearby occupiers and/or amenity users.

The site is attached to the Royal British Legion a licensed premises with a function room. Opening hours are advertised as 12:00 - 23:00 Friday - Saturday, 12 - 20:00 Sunday, 14:30 - 20:00 Monday and 14:30 - 23:00 Tuesday - Thursday.

Commercial properties, fronting Bolton Street are also located to the east/front of the site. These uses include shops cafes, restaurants, bars and takeaways.

No noise assessment has been submitted with the application. Environmental Health have confirmed that insufficient information has been provided by the applicant in relation to noise. Given the location of the site in close proximity to commercial properties with various opening hours, and attached to a property with late opening hours it is considered any noise assessment and required mitigations would be required prior to determination and could not be supplied by condition.

Highways and Access

UDP Policy EN1/2 requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access, parking and service provision. This is further supported by UDP Policy H2/2 that requires proposals to demonstrate adequate car parking provision, access for both vehicles and pedestrians, and provision for public transport and the existence of any public rights of way. P/E Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 require streets to be well designed and managed to make a significant positive contribution to the quality of place and support high levels of walking, cycling and public transport.

There is presently no footpath running along the front of the site. The missing footway on the westerly side of Central Street, results from a legacy of changes to the building's Central Street elevation. The Traffic Section consider that this footway should be provided on the adopted highway to a scope and specification to be agreed as part of the proposed development and to provide a safe pedestrian route to the building and uses proposed.

Communal bins have previously been located to the front of the site on the adopted highway. This is an offence under the Highways Act 1980. The block plan does not show bin storage for either the proposed E uses at ground floor, or the first floor uses to ensure that bins could be adequately stored within the curtilage of the site for all uses proposed.

Parking

In terms of parking standards UDP Policy HT2/4 requires all applications for development to make adequate provision for their car parking and servicing requirements. Supplementary Planning Document 11 (SPD11) provides parking standards for developments.

The site is located within Zone 2 for parking.

The application form states 2no. parking spaces exist on site, and 2no. spaces are proposed to be retained. These parking spaces are not included on the block plan for

assessment to ensure compliance with SPD 11.

SPD 11 would require 3 spaces for the proposed residential units (1 per unit and 0.5 round to 1 for visitors). The parking needs for the ground floor units would be dependent on their end use, which is assessed within SPD 11 on particular sub-paragraphs within Class E. This has not been clarified within the submission.

No details have been provided to show cycle storage for any of the uses proposed on site.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

PfE Policy JP-G8 states that through local planning and associated activities a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought. This is supported by UDP Policy EN6/3 that seeks to retain, protect and enhance the natural environment and seeks to retain features of ecological or wildlife value. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. UDP Policy EN8/2 supports and encourages new woodland and tree planting within the borough.

Given the nature of the site it is accepted that the de-minimis exception would apply to this site.

Carbon And Energy

JP-S2 - Carbon & Energy sets out the steps required to achieve net zero carbon emissions. A statement will need to be provided to show how the proposal complies with this policy. Any inclusion of heat pumps, PVs etc need to be shown on site plans and elevations and specifications should be detailed.

A Statement has been provided that confirms that the proposal would comply with the requirements of Part L of the building regulations and that opportunities for on site renewable energy have been considered and discounted on the basis of viability and practicality. The statement does not expand on what opportunities have been reviewed, or why they have been discounted.

Digital Connectivity

PfE Policy JP-C2 requires development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting. A statement will need to be provided to show how the proposal complies with this policy.

A statement has been provided that confirms that internal infrastructure, including ducting and connection points, will be installed to facilitate future-proofed digital connectivity.

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 external alterations to the property, would by virtue of their scale, design and materials introduce discordant features into the Ramsbottom Conservation Area where it is the intention of the Local Planning Authority to secure a high standard of development in relation to alterations by requiring the use of sympathetic and compatible building forms and materials. The proposed external alterations would neither preserve nor enhance the conservation area within which the site is located and would have an unacceptable impact on a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, that would lead to a development that is neither sympathetic to nor compatible with the historic significance of the building. The proposal therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 Conservation Area Control, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development, Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-P1 - Sustainable Places and JP-P2 - Heritage, Ramsbottom Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The application and submitted plans fail to adequately assess the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the identified Non-Designated Heritage Asset through the submitted Heritage Statement. The applicant has failed to submit full details of the existing and proposed site layouts, windows, site sections, and existing retaining wall. The proposal also includes inaccurate existing and proposed elevations. It is considered that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development as a whole would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the identified Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The proposal therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 Conservation Area Control, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development, Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-P1 - Sustainable Places and JP-P2 - Heritage, Ramsbottom Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development for 2no dwellings on the site of circa 0.0375 hectares would make optimal use of the potential of the site in relation to identified site specific constraints. Therefore, the proposed development would not make efficient use of land conflicting with Policy JP-H4 - Density of New Housing of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 4 The development would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of future occupants due to the failure to demonstrate compliance with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) through the provision of adequate Gross Internal Area, bedroom area and in built storage. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development, Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-P1 - Sustainable Places , JP-H3 - Type, Size and Design of New Housing and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 The proposed development would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of future occupiers by reason of the lack of outdoor amenity space and failure to demonstrate that adequate separation distances can be provided between the proposed habitable room dormer windows and existing rear retaining wall. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Unitary Development Plan Policy H1/2 - Further Housing Development, H2/4 - Conversions and Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

- 6 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient, topographical survey based information in order for the following to be properly assessed:

1. Provision of safe pedestrian access to the ground floor entrances/exits from Central Street.
2. Provision of in curtilage servicing, parking and cycle storage arrangements that comply with Supplementary Planning Document 11: Parking Standards in Bury, located clear of the adopted highway.
3. Bin storage and waste collection arrangements for the mixture of proposed uses on site.

The proposed development therefore conflicts with Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development, Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-C5 - Streets for All, JP-C6 - Walking and Cycling, JP-P1 - Sustainable Places and the National Planning Policy Framework and Supplementary Planning Document 11: Parking Standards in Bury.

- 7 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of future occupiers, by reason of the noise, disturbance and general activity associated with the existing neighbouring uses without the need for mitigations to the building that may require planning permission. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan H2/1- The Form of New Residential Development, H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development, H2/4 - Conversions, EN7/2 - Noise Pollution, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H3/1 Assessing Non-Conforming Uses, H3/2 Existing Incompatible Uses and Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework Policies JP-P1 - Sustainable Places, JP-P2 - Heritage.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP	22/06/2026	HL	25.06.2026