

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Claire Booth	Date of report: 03/06/2026	Ref: 73130/PIP
Registration: 29/04/2026	LDfC: 03/06/2026	Expiry Date: 03/06/2026
Site Visit: 05/05/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 19	Con Area:	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for the erection of 8-9 dwellings

Location: Land at Hazel Hall Lane, Ramsbottom

Description

This application is a Permission in Principle (PIP) proposal for the erection of 9 dwellings on land associated with Holcombe Brook Tennis Club. It is located at the northern end of the Tennis Club site, and abuts the boundary of Hazel Hall Lane. Hazel Hall Cottages and their associated land, are located on the opposite side of Hazel Hall Lane to the northern boundary of the application site.

Hazel Hall Lane is a single track hedge lined lane that runs along the xxxx boundary of the Tennis Club site and the application site.

Proposal

The application seeks Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up to 8 or 9 dwellings.

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (as amended), the matters which can be considered by the Local Planning Authority in determining whether or not to grant Permission in Principle are limited to:

- the location of development,
- the land use proposed, and
- the amount of development proposed.

A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing - led development.

The PiP consent 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 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 application.

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

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.

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.

Site Allocations

Adopted Green Belt

River Valley Area

Mineral Safeguarding Area

Landcape Character Area Holcombe to Greenmount and Higher Summerseat - Urban

Fringe Farmland

Relevant Planning History

42996 - Construction of 13 New Tennis Courts (9 with Floodlights), New Clubhouse, car park, 2 Childrens Courts, Practice Wall & Landscaping - Refused, 13/10/2004

42996 - Construction of 13 new tennis courts (9 with floodlights); new clubhouse; car park; 2 children's courts; practice wall and landscaping at land off Hazel Hall Lane, Summerseat. Refused - 13 October 2004

This application was refused as the proposed development would harm the openness of the Green Belt and the access arrangements were inadequate.

45384 - Construction of 9 no. tennis courts (5 with floodlighting); new clubhouse; car park; 2 children's courts; practice wall and landscaping (resubmission) at land off Hazel Hall Lane, Summerseat. Refused - 20 December 2005

This application was refused as the proposed development would harm the openness of the Green Belt.

Surrounding sites

43054 - Three storey block of 55 sheltered flats for the elderly together with house managers accommodation, car parking and landscaping at Holcombe Brook Tennis Club, Longsight Road, Holcombe Brook. Refused - 13 October 2004

This application was refused as there was a loss of recreational space, a lack of provision for public art, no provision for affordable housing, the access arrangements were inadequate and the application and plans contained insufficient information.

45387 - Erection of 55 sheltered flats for the elderly together with house managers accommodation, car parking and landscaping at Holcombe Brook Tennis Club, Longsight Road, Holcombe Brook. Refused - 20 December 2005

This application was refused as there was a loss of recreational space, inadequate provision made for affordable housing and insufficient parking provision.

50418 - Erection of 55 category II sheltered flats for the elderly and house manager's accommodation; landscaping and car parking at Holcombe Brook Tennis Club, Longsight Road, Holcombe Brook. Withdrawn - 6 August 2009

This application was withdrawn as there were issues relating to the loss of recreational space, a lack of provision for affordable housing and public art, impact upon residential amenity, impact upon trees, insufficient information in relation to design and unsatisfactory arrangements for disabled people

53231 - Erection of 55 category II sheltered flats for the elderly, communal facilities, landscaping and car parking at Holcombe Brook Tennis Club, Longsight Road, Holcombe Brook. Received - 28 October 2010

50419 - Construction of 9 tennis courts (6 with floodlighting); new clubhouse; associated car parking; junior coaching area and landscaping at land off Summerseat Lane, Summerseat. Withdrawn - 31 July 2009

This application was withdrawn.

53246 - Construction of 8 tennis courts (6 with floodlighting), club house, associated car parking and landscaping at land to the north of Summerseat Lane, Summerseat. Received - 28 October 2010

53247 - Construction of 8 Tennis Courts (6 with floodlighting), club house, associated car parking, mini tennis area with practice wall and landscaping - Approved with Conditions, 02/03/2011

Publicity

The application has been advertised by Site Notice erected at the entrance to the Tennis Club Longsight Road. Date posted: 05 May 2026.

12 neighbours have been consulted by letter. 25 representations have been received; 6 letters of support and 19 letters of objection.

The letters of support raising the following matters:

- Increasing the offering of new housing which is only a small number would give further stock to the area without big impact on infrastructure and much needed. The whole of the plan to also increase facilities for more leisure and support is a commendable addition to the community..
- The proposal comes forward at a time when the Council is failing to meet its housing delivery targets. It would provide up to 9 well-designed homes in a sustainable location adjacent to Summerseat and close to Holcombe Brook, where local amenities and regular bus services are within walking distance.
- The site makes only a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes and can reasonably be regarded as "grey belt" land. Given the borough's unmet housing need, the principle of development is considered acceptable.
- Not an overdevelopment of the field. The scheme is limited to a small linear form of development following the existing road frontage.
- Funds generated would be fully reinvested into the adjacent Sports and Tennis Club to secure its long-term viability and improve community sporting facilities for future generations.
- Asserts the Sports Club is located a reasonable distance from any houses nearby and in no way causes problems or nuisance to those residents.

The letters of objections received raise the following concerns:

- The site is designated greenbelt land, which exists to prevent urban sprawl and protect the character and openness of the countryside.
- Building on this land would result in the permanent loss of valuable green space used and enjoyed by local residents.
- Unsustainable Location - The site is outside the settlement boundary and the development would be car-dependent on a single lane unadopted road which has no sewer or water drainage in place. This field already floods in the winter causing a pond to form.
- There will be an increase traffic on (Hazel Hall Lane) which already sees additional use

from the tennis club. This raises highway safety concerns.

- The development would negatively affect local wildlife habitats and biodiversity and result in loss of hedgerow.
- Existing infrastructure in the area, including roads, schools, GP surgeries, and public services, is already under pressure and would struggle to cope with additional housing.
- Increased traffic and congestion would have a significant impact on road safety, pollution, and residents' quality of life.
- The proposal would alter the rural character and visual appearance of the area, setting a concerning precedent for future development on protected land.
- The application does not demonstrate the "very special circumstances" normally required to justify inappropriate development within the greenbelt.
- Query what application approvals at the Tennis Club remain extant and whether the Tennis Club is breaching Planning Conditions.

Whilst the representations received have been noted, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (as amended), the matters which can be considered by the Local Planning Authority in determining whether or not to grant Permission in Principle are limited to the location of development, the land use proposed, and the amount of development proposed. It is therefore only the comments received relating to these matters that have been considered.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Raise concerns about the safety of the site access but note that highway safety, access parking and servicing matters are assessed at Technical Details stage (Stage 2 of the Permission in Principle process).

Waste Management - No comments or observations received.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No objections, subject to a condition securing a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - It is noted that this is a Stage 1 Permission in Principle application to establish the principle of development. As such conditions cannot be recommended, but they raise comments below regarding the information required for submission at the subsequent Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No comments or observations received.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objections, subject to a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme.

GMCA - Minerals and Waste - No objections

Public Rights of Way Officer - Notes that part of Hazel Hall Lane is unadopted and is not a definitive public right of way.

Planning & Building Regs consultation Fire Protection Dept Bury Fire Station (Part B)
- No comments or observations received.

Pre-start Conditions - Not applicable

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guide
JP-C1	Our Integrated Network
JP-G9	The Green Belt

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.

The Permission in Principle (PiP) application seeks to establish whether in principle, the site is suitable for a residential development for up to 9 no. dwellings.

The scope of permission in principle is 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 planning conditions cannot be attached to a PiP approval. These can be placed as informatives to advise on any technical details application that may follow.

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

Land Use and Location of Development

Site's location within the Green Belt

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

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

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

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

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

- 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;
- There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
- Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.

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

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

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

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

Planning guidance published on 27th February 2025 for assessing a site against these

purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision making (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl

The site is located on the edge of Holcombe Brook, a village, and therefore cannot be regarded as a 'large built-up area' for the purposes of criterion (a). The site is partially contained by established boundaries, including Longsight Road, with built development on either side, as well as the Holcombe Brook Sports and Tennis Club and adjacent dwellings along Hazel Hall Lane.

In this context, the proposal would not appear incongruous and would instead represent a logical rounding off of existing development. The site therefore makes a weak contribution to Purpose (a).

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighbouring towns merging

The guidance specifies that this purpose relates to the merging of towns, not villages. The site is located between the towns of Bury and Ramsbottom; however, it does not form part of any substantial gap between them. The site could be developed without any significant impact on the visual separation of these towns. As such, it is considered that the site makes a weak contribution toward Purpose (b).

Grey Belt conclusion

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

Criterion A Considering the impact on the remaining Green Belt in the plan area

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

The only other Green Belt purpose which would be breached by the proposal is Purpose C safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as the development would represent an irreversible encroachment of built form into the countryside. However, the area to be lost is small in relation to the totality of the remaining Green Belt land both in the local area, and the wider plan area. Consequently, the overall effect on the countryside would be moderate.

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

Criterion B Demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

This criterion requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need, which in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, means:

- A lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or
- Where the Housing Delivery Test is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

Five year supply

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the

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

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

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

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 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.

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

As set out above, as a result of the lack of five-year supply and the latest published Housing Delivery Test result there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed and Criterion B is met.

Criterion C Sustainable location

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

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

In this regard, PfE Policy JP-C1: An Integrated Network sets relevant advice, supporting:

- Patterns of development that minimises both the need to travel and the distance travelled by unsustainable modes to jobs, housing and other key services, including healthcare, education, retail, recreation and leisure facilities, green space and green infrastructure; and
- Locating and designing development, to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport;

The site is located within approximately 0.5 miles of a range of everyday amenities and services, it also benefits from proximity to a bus stop providing regular services at approximately 20-minute intervals, offering connections to nearby centres (Bury and Ramsbottom). The surrounding road network includes pedestrian routes which enable access to these facilities' convenient manner, however the unlit, uneven path down Hazel Hall Lane towards Longsight Road could provide an unsafe walking environment with accessibility issues. It is referenced in the planning statement as the preferred route to access some of the amenities despite being seemingly privately owned land. All amenities would still be accessible via the alternative route (through Gainsborough and Newcombe Road onto Longsight Road) so the site is still sustainable however, there would need to be more details and clarification on the matter at technical stages.

Given the scale and location of the development, the site is well-related to existing infrastructure, and no significant off-site interventions would be required to support sustainable travel to and from the site to the services, amenities, schools etc required by Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Policy JP-C1.

The proposed development would therefore be located in an area that is, and will remain, sustainable. It would provide opportunities for travel by modes other than the private car, in

accordance with criteria 1 and 3 of Places for Everyone Policy JP-C1. As such, the proposal meets criterion C of NPPF paragraph 155.

Green Belt Conclusion

The site falls within the definition of Grey Belt land and meets all the required criteria a-c of NPPF paragraph 155. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle on this site within the Green Belt.

Amount of development

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 of Development

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 35 dwellings per hectare applies.

The site covers an area of approximately 0.24 hectares, so development at 35dph would equate to 8.4 dwellings on the site. 8 dwellings would equate to 33 dwellings per hectare, 9 would equate to 38dph, which would comply with Policy JP-H4.

PfE 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 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 site's Green Belt location would not automatically justify a lower density.

The applied for number of dwellings would comply with the required number of dwellings to accord with PfE Policy JP-H4.

Conclusion

The site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land and is considered to be 'not inappropriate' in accordance with NPPF paragraph 155 criterions a-c.

As the site falls within this definition, in accordance with paragraph 11 (d)(i), the 'tilted balance' applies.

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

The amount of development proposed is in accordance with the density requirements set out in PfE Policy JP-H4 and is considered acceptable.

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

Consultee Responses and considerations for a Technical Details Consent

Highway Authority

Raise concerns about the safety of the site access but note that highway safety, access parking and servicing matters are assessed at Technical Details stage - Stage 2 of the Permission in Principle process.

They also note that Hazel Hall Road is on a historic Tottington UDC list of unadopted roads. However, that list is not dated and it has a distance recorded of 670 feet, which is not readily apportioned to any particular part of Hazel Hall Road which is much longer than that in its entirety. It is not on the Council's Definitive Map and the Council do not record it in the s36 list of streets. There is sufficient evidence that it is not maintainable at public expense. It appears to have highway rights by long usage. Those rights appear to be for all use including vehicles.

The developer will need to evidence lawful control or permission to carry out any works on Hazel Hall Road, without which, any alteration or works may constitute unlawful interference with a highway. We could not support any proposal unless and until lawful rights were demonstrated.

There is contradictory information within the submission over where the site would be accessed from that needs to be addressed at Technical Details Stage.

Highway Authority PROW team

The continuation of Hazel Hall Road beyond the adopted section, linking to Longsight Road is a highway. It is not included on the Definitive Rights of Way records and is unadopted. As a result, it is not maintainable at public expense. As it lies outside the ownership of the applicant, it would not be possible for works to be carried out on this section of Hazel Hall Lane without the (unknown) landowner's permission and any further planning permissions that may be required.

The Planning Statement states 'access would be from Hazel Hall Lane via Summerseat and not via Longsight Road'. The statement then describes the regular bus service on Longsight Road which is within walking distance and the facilities on Longsight Road/Vernon Road. Whilst it would be possible to use adopted highways to walk to Longsight Road, the Statement includes a plan showing the 4 minute walking time along the unadopted section of Hazel Hall Lane - the section that is described as not being used as access. This contradiction needs to be addressed at Technical Details stage..

If access is from the existing adopted section of Hazel Hall Road, it should be noted that the adoption ends before the red edged site and the applicant may require the permission of the landowner to access the site/carry out any improvements to the access.

Landscape Character

The site is within the Holcombe to Greenmount and Higher Summerseat (LCA 22), an area of Incised Urban Fringe Farmland as assessed by the GM Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment.

Policy JP-G1: Landscape Character states that development within a Landscape Character Type should reflect and respond to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key landscape characteristics of its location, including having regard to:

- Topography, geology and drainage;
- Land use and field patterns;
- Semi-natural habitats and woodland cover;
- Archaeology and cultural heritage;
- Settlement, road pattern and rights of way; and
- Views and perceptual qualities.

The interface of new development with the surrounding countryside/landscape is of particular importance. These transitional areas require well-considered and sensitive treatment. In particular, opportunities to improve the intactness and condition of the landscape should be taken.

Trees and Hedgerows

The site contains trees and hedgerows. These should be retained where possible.

Any application should be accompanied by an BS5837 compliant Arboricultural Assessment and tree constraints plans, as existing and as shown in context with the proposed development.

Any tree loss should be replaced on a 2 for one basis, in accordance with the requirements of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, Policy JP-G7: Trees and Woodland.

Biodiversity and Biodiversity Net Gain

PfE policy JP-G8 requires development to follow the mitigation hierarchy of avoiding significant harm to biodiversity through consideration of alternative sites, then adequately mitigating and compensating for any remaining harm. It also requires development to avoid fragmenting or severing connectivity between habitats and to achieve a net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%. This reflects national statutory requirements.

This policy requires planning applications to be accompanied by a completed metric and written statement or draft Biodiversity Gain Plan. The policy also requires proposals to make appropriate provision for long-term management of habitats and geological features connected to the development. This information will be required at the technical details stage.

The Council is not aware of any ecological issues associated with this site that would prevent planning permission being granted with the exception of the trees and hedgerows bordering the site, it is very unlikely that there would be any ecological issue that would prevent permission being granted.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit recommend that as part of any technical details stage a preliminary ecological appraisal, any other ecological surveys recommended by the PEA and a biodiversity net gain assessment be provided.

As the development site is over 0.2ha biodiversity net gain will apply, even once the de minimis threshold is raised.

Contaminated Land

A sensitive end use is proposed; as such, to avoid pre-commencement conditions sufficient information must be submitted at Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, to demonstrate that no remedial measures are required or to agree such measures. Further information regarding Land Contamination and the planning process can be found in Bury Council's Developers Guide, available on the Council's website and on the Planning Portal.

Air Quality

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

Bury Council has been identified by DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. To support the principles of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan in reducing levels of nitrogen dioxide and in order to manage current and future levels of air pollution Bury Council is encouraging the use of cleaner vehicles. As such and in line the

requirements of the Building Regulations (The Building Regulations 2010, Approved Document S, Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles), as part of the Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, the developer should provide information regarding Electric Vehicle Infrastructure to the following specification:

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

*Mode 3, 7kW (32A) single phase, or 22kW (32A) three phase, and for 50kW Mode 4 rapid charging may be required. British Standard BS EN 61851-1:2019 to be used. Further information regarding minimum standards can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/transport/low-emission-and-electric-vehicles>.

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

Planning Obligations

This proposal is for 8 - 9 dwellings, which would not ordinarily require contributions for recreation or affordable housing.

However, this site appears to be part of a wider parcel of land to the rear of Holcombe Brook Tennis club.

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 planning statement states that it is not the intention of the landowner to erect additional dwellinghouses in the remainder of the field, however in the event that the adjoining land is also brought forward for residential development, 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.

Carbon and Energy

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

Digital Connectivity

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

Active Travel

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

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

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

Drainage

Response from United Utilities - This is available to view on the Council's Website under this application - please read in full and provide the information they request at Technical

Details stage and note the recommended planning conditions.

Response from the Council Drainage Section - This is available to view on the Council's website. They raise no objections subject to satisfactory drainage being provided that would be secured by condition(s) at Technical Details Stage.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions and Reasons:

The Principle of Permission hereby granted is for a period of 3 years from the date of this decision. This is the prescribed period as set out in the Town & Country Planning Act 199, Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 as amended. The "Notes to Applicant" below provides guidance on what the detailed proposals should include at the Technical Details Stage.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
CB	03/06/2026	DM	03.06.2026