

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 01/09/2026	Ref: 73435/PIP
Registration: 24/07/2026	LDFC: 19/08/2026	Expiry Date: 28/08/2026
Site Visit: 31/07/2026	Site Notice: 31/07/2026	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 15	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for 5 - 8 no. dwellings

Location: Land North of 329 Whalley Road, Shuttleworth, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 0ER

Description

The site relates to a field and open land located to the west of Whalley Road. The site is located in the Green Belt (Policy JP-G9), River Valley (Policy OL5/2) and falls within a Landscape Character Area (Policy JP-G1).

The application seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for between 5-8 no. dwellings. 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 detail or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP.

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

To assess PiP applications, a Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) consideration is limited to location, land use and amount of development, with other matters considered at technical details stage.

Local Planning Authorities consult anybody that would be required to be consulted in relation to an application for planning permission but matters relating to ecology, landscaping, contamination, design, transport/highways and heritage are considered in a Stage 2 Technical Details application. Any responses received can be included as informatives notes to advise the applicant of the requirements at a technical details stage.

Conditions cannot be attached to a PiP.

Relevant Planning History

n/a

Publicity

Letters sent to 15 properties on 29/7/26.

Site notice posted 31/7/26.

15 objections received with the following issues -

DELEGATED REPORT

- The site is located within the Green Belt and the proposal is considered inappropriate development.
- The land is established open countryside, currently used for grazing sheep and lambs, and makes a significant contribution to Green Belt openness.
- Dispute that the site is "Grey Belt" land. The site does not resemble previously developed, derelict, or low-quality land.
- Loss of openness and an encroachment into the countryside.
- Do not regard the development as limited infill given the separation between existing development and the edge of Edenfield.
- Contrary to the purposes of Green Belt designation, particularly safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- Green Belt boundaries should only be reviewed through the plan-making process, not through piecemeal planning applications.
- It would urbanise an open field and erode the rural character of the area.
- It would adversely affect views across the Irwell Valley and towards Holcombe Hill and be prominent and intrusive within the open landscape.
- Harmful to the character of the West Pennine Moors Special Landscape Area.
- Loss of existing open views and experience a deterioration in visual amenity.
- Incongruous with the established rural setting of Shuttleworth.
- The site is unsuitable for residential development due to flooding and drainage constraints.
- The site fronts the busy A58 Whalley Road, where traffic speeds and volumes are a significant concern.
- The road has been the location of serious and fatal collisions.
- Additional dwellings would worsen highway safety.
- Limited parking provision may result in overspill parking on the highway.
- Residents already experience difficulties accessing driveways and parking safely due to traffic congestion.
- Local infrastructure is already operating at capacity.
- Recent and ongoing housing developments have already placed significant pressure on local facilities.
- Additional housing is likely to exacerbate existing infrastructure deficiencies.
- The site provides habitat for wildlife and contributes to local biodiversity and development could result in habitat loss and disturbance to wildlife.
- Increased pollution associated with further residential development.
- Approval could establish an undesirable precedent for further development on adjacent Green Belt land and would lead to the gradual infilling of open land along Whalley Road and merging of Shuttleworth and Edenfield.
- We were not notified of the application despite living in close proximity to the site.
- Inaccuracies of the size of site in the application
- Mis-application of the Grey belt policy - the site is open land with a 115m frontage
- Undermining Green Belt Purposes A - to check unrestricted sprawl and B to prevent neighbouring towns from merging.
- Harmful precedent for urban sprawl
- Severe highway safety and traffic impacts - conflict of movement, cumulative traffic pressures, pedestrian vulnerability, on street parking overspill
- Destruction of Green Belt, Landscape Character, and Local Aesthetics
- Loss of biodiversity
- Flooding and drainage risks
- Misleading address of Shuttleworth rather than Ramsbottom
- Failure of the application to address other applications which were refused in the area
- No certainty the applicant can deliver a complex residential scheme within local policy time lines
- This land holding has demonstrated disregard for other unauthorised development
- Should the application be approved, robust conditions should be attached - hydrological and surface water drainage strategy and highway safety and micro-traffic modelling should be carried out.
- The land is part of the open spaces of Ramsbottom and is precious grazing land and

- should be a protected public amenity for future generations to enjoy.
- Shuttleworth is an historic village, which will lose its character and identity and once lost it is gone forever.
- The countryside is already scarred by over development so many trees and hedgerows in this area alone have been felled and grubbed up in recent years
- England ranks in the bottom 10% in Western Europe for retention of natural biodiversity, roughly 1 in 6 species in the U.K. faces extinction as a result of compounded human pressures.
- Eventually there won't be a blade of grass left standing and we will have merged with Ramsbottom and Edenfield, and probably Bury.
- There are so many houses already and disruptions due to development we rarely get out bins emptied on time as it is.
- Anyone who believes that people will buy a house on a bus route with the intention of using public transport is deluded.
- Planning permission has already been granted for a housing development directly opposite the Duckworth Arms. - Work on that approved site has not yet commenced.
- The local housing need should be met by prioritizing these already-approved schemes and brownfield sites, rather than sacrificing pristine Green Belt.
- Construction Disruptions: The construction phase will introduce heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) onto a fast, busy road, creating significant logistical bottlenecks and safety hazards.
- Operational Traffic: The cumulative impact of residential traffic from this site-combined with the future traffic from the approved site opposite the Duckworth Arms-will severely worsen local congestion.
- Whalley Road is not like a road in - this is not an urban environment, this is a rural road. There are no side roads to take you an alternative way to get to the same location, there is only forward or backwards.
- Already significant traffic problems in the area

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No comments received.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - Recommend a condition for a drainage scheme at a Technical Approval stage

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - Require detailed information at Technical Details Stage

Waste Management - No comments received

United Utilities (Water and waste) - Recommend submission of a drainage scheme at Technical Details stage

Transport for Greater Manchester - No comments to make

GMCA - Minerals and Waste consultations - Comments made

Planning & Building Regs Consultation Fire Protection Dept - No comments received

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - Submission of ecology reports and BNG at Technical Details Stage

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity

JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
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.

Housing Land Supply and the Principle of Residential Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions. NPPF Policy HO7 gives substantial weight to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.

NPPF Annex D paragraph 8 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 an appropriate buffer. The supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in the development plan where this is 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.

The buffer applicable to the five-year supply assessment is based on NPPF Annex D paragraph 9. In Bury's case, a 5% buffer is required in accordance with paragraph 9c.

A 20% buffer is no longer required because:

- the latest Housing Delivery Test result exceeds 85% (NPPF Annex D paragraph 9b: 2025 result = 114%); and
- the collective PfE requirement for all 9 PfE districts exceeds 80% of the LHN for those 9 districts (NPPF Annex D paragraph 9c: 10,305 PfE target against LHN of 12,470 = 83%).

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 five-year supply, a supply of 2,231 homes has been identified for the period from 2025-2030. This is set against a requirement for 2,270 homes (including a 5% buffer and having taken account of past over delivery). The Council can therefore demonstrate a 4.9 year supply of housing land including a 5% buffer (or 4.7 years if past over delivery is excluded). There is therefore currently a slight shortfall in the five-year supply against the adopted housing requirement. Whilst the proposal is only for 5 to 8 dwellings, it would nevertheless make a small positive contribution to the housing land supply, which weighs in favour of the application.

NPPF Policy S3 sets out the presumption in favour of development. This site is not within a settlement and is within the Green Belt, therefore in accordance with NPPF Policy S5(5) should be assessed against NPPF Green Belt Policies GB6 and GB7.

As a result of the lack of five-year supply, NPPF Policy GB7(1)(g)(ii) is triggered and there is an evidenced unmet need for residential development.

Green Belt

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

Policy GB6 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.

Policy GB6 also 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.

Policy GB7 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 Policy GB7.

Policy GB7(1)(g) of the NPPF also 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 an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference policy TR3 of the Framework; and
- In the case of major development involving the provision of housing, the development proposed complies with policy GB8.

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 Policy GB2. '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 Policy GB2.

Policy GB2 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 to the North-East of Ramsbottom between Shuttleworth, a hamlet, and Edenfield, a village, meaning that neither are regarded as a 'large built-up area' for the purposes of criterion (a). There is already a small amount of residential development present at the site. The proposed PiP would be contained by development with dwellings to the North/South and the M66 and A56 to the West/East.

In this context, the proposal would not appear incongruous and would be contained by other developments. 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 it does not form part of any substantial gap between them. 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, (i) to (iii), listed in NPPF Policy GB7(g).

Criterion G i 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.

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

Criterion C Sustainable location

NPPF Policy GB7 criterion G iii requires consideration of whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to policy TR3 of the Framework.

Policy TR3 states that 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. Developments 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

There are frequent bus services along the A56 to Bury and Rawtenstall and the site is located approximately 1km from the closest town centre at Ramsbottom (supermarkets, pharmacies, GP, schools and post office), equating to a 15-minute walk. As such, it is considered that the site is in a location which lends itself to a range of active and sustainable transport modes and is within a reasonable distance from key services that users of the proposed development may wish to access.

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.

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 G iii of NPPF Policy GB7.

Green Belt Conclusion

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

In accordance with NPPF Policy S5(5) where development would not be inappropriate in the Green Belt, proposals should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.

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.

River Valley

Policy OL5/2 states that within the River Valleys, new buildings or the change of use of existing buildings or the change of use of land will not be permitted. The only exceptions considered acceptable will be those where the development would not lead to the division of the open parts of the valleys into sections and it falls within the terms below:

- where the area is designated as Green Belt the established Green Belt policies will apply; or
- where the area does not form part of the Green Belt, at least one of the following circumstances is met:

- that the development represents limited infilling to an established valley settlement or industrial area;
- that it is an extension to, or renewal of an existing industry, where the economic and employment factors are of overriding importance;
- that the development is required in association with an outdoor recreation or appropriate tourist facility;
- that the development is limited and will form part of, and be essential to, the maintenance of the provision and improvement of public services and utilities;
- any other development that would be appropriate in the Green Belt.

As the development would be seen as appropriate within the Green Belt as it satisfies the criteria to be classified as Grey Belt – therefore it is in compliance with Policy OL5/2 and would be acceptable in principle.

Housing

Type, Size and Design of New Housing

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

Density

NPPF Policy L3 expects development proposals to make efficient use of land.

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 0.17 hectares, so development at 35dph would equate to 6 dwellings.

The proposal is for 5 to 8 dwellings. 5 dwellings would equate to 29 dwellings per hectare, 8 would equate to 47dph. 5 dwellings would be below 35dph, however 6-8 dwellings would comply with Policy JP-H4.

NPPF Policy L3(2)(b) applies to sites outside settlements, and expects development footprints to make the best use of a site's development potential. As set out in NPPF Policy L3(4), development proposals that do not make efficient use of land in accordance with paragraph 2 of the policy should be refused. As this application is for Permission in Principle, the development footprint is not set at this stage. This will therefore require further consideration at the technical details stage.

Landscape Character Area

The site is within the Knowl and Rooley Moors, Fringes and Foothills (LCA 24), an area of Pennine Foothills (West/South Pennines) 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.

The rear/western boundary of the proposed development aligns with the existing development within the area.

Conclusion

The adverse impacts of developing this site are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. The national requirement to significantly boost the supply of housing under the NPPF is a material consideration that would favour the release of this site in principle, subject to detail.

Consultee responses

Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)

The quantum of development falls below TfGM's threshold for a highway impact review. There are no details provided in terms of the layout of the dwellings. As such, there are no comments from a TfGM perspective.

Ecology

GMEU have no objection to this Permission in Principle application. However, the site is likely to have some ecological value and may support protected species. Therefore, GMEU would expect that the necessary assessments and surveys to be undertaken should detailed 'Technical Details Consent' be sought, in line with current planning policy and relevant legislation and to ensure that protected species have been fully considered.

In addition, the proposals may be subject to mandatory biodiversity net gain, depending on the findings of any ecological surveys and the final size of the application site.

United Utilities

Should this proposal be approved, and an application submitted for Technical Detail Consent, it is important to note that our response to a subsequent application will be based upon the information that is available at the time of response, and therefore, our position and advice may vary.

All options for the sustainable management of surface water must be thoroughly investigated before we will accept any surface water connections from new development to the public sewer. Where a new surface water connection to the public sewer is proposed, we will require robust evidence to demonstrate the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and there are no more sustainable options available for the management of surface water.

In the event of a Technical Details Consent a condition would be recommended as follows -

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

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

The approved schemes shall be in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) or any subsequent replacement national standards. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Contaminated Land

The site is currently in agricultural use as such there is the potential for contamination to be present. Furthermore, 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 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.

Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste

The Greater Manchester Minerals Plan (adopted 2013) forms part of Bury's Development

DELEGATED REPORT

Plan and sets out policies relating to minerals, including the safeguarding of mineral resources.

The proposed development is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sandstone. Greater Manchester Minerals Plan Policy 8 - Prior Extraction of Mineral Resources Within Mineral Safeguarding Areas is relevant here. This policy seeks to protect mineral resources from sterilisation by other forms of development.

Policy 8 requires that non-mineral development proposals within the mineral safeguarding area should extract any viable mineral resources present in advance of construction, provided it is acceptable to do so. Proposals for non-mineral development within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas that do not allow for the prior extraction of minerals will only be permitted in certain circumstances (criteria 1 - 4).

The applicant does not appear to have submitted any information in relation to the Greater Manchester Minerals Plan. However, given the close proximity of the proposed site to existing dwellings it is unlikely that mineral extraction in this location would be environmentally acceptable and therefore would meet Criterion 2 of Policy 8.

Recommendation: Approve

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 1990, 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> JT 1/9/26	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u> HL 01.09.2026	<u>Date</u>
----------------------------------	-------------	--	-------------