

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 03/09/2026	Ref: 73138/FUL
Registration: 16/07/2026	LDFC: 27/08/2026	Expiry Date: 10/09/2026
Site Visit: 31/07/2026	Site Notice: 31/07/2026	Press Date: 06/08/2026
Objections: 0	Con Area: RAMS	Adv Type: CAAF
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIOT

Proposal: Single storey extension at front

Location: Clark Craft Products, Empire Works, Railway Street, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9AS

Description

The site relates to a 2 storey commercial building which is located in Ramsbottom Town Centre. The site is just outside of the Ramsbottom Conservation Area which is to the north. The building is located on a corner and fronts Railway Street beyond which is a public car park running linear to the East Lancs Railway. There is also a public car park to the north and a supermarket to the south. Behind the premises is a metalworks.

The premises is in a commercial use comprising a craft supply shop and cafe. The building has a flat roof and the original part of the front elevation is symmetrical with its display window placements either side of a recessed central entrance which has a balcony above at the first floor. A 2 storey side extension was later added to the original building. Elevations comprise concrete brick.

The application proposes a single storey front extension which would project 750mm forward of the existing front elevation of the original building and would extend 13.4m across the frontage and would cover the existing main entrance and the two large display windows. The extension would be 2.7m high to the eaves and 3.8m to the ridge and would have a mono-pitched roof. The front elevation would be brick built and comprise a central entrance with a brick plinth and glazing either side.

Relevant Planning History

69504 - Provision of 2 no. ground floor bay windows, new ground floor windows, retracting canopy to existing balcony; Render to front elevation; New shop front to side elevation. - Approve with Conditions 07/07/2023

Publicity

Letters sent to 2 properties on 17/7/26.
Site notice posted 31/7/25
Press advert 6/8/26

No responses received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Object

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No response received

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No comments to make

Environmental Health - Pollution Control - No comments to make

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No response received

Conservation - Object

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
EC4/1	Small Businesses
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/8	Shop Fronts
S1/2	Shopping in Other Town Centres
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy

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.

Design and appearance

UDP Policy EN1/8 - Shop Fronts seeks to ensure that proposals for new and altered shop fronts properly respect the architectural elements of the building and character of the surrounding streetscene.

Proposals which are unsympathetic to the building or its surroundings or which break up a harmonious group of buildings will not be permitted.

The NPPF Chapter 14 - Achieving well-designed places, Policy DP3 paragraph 1 states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

At para 2, to create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect aspects which includes g) identity: to create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place and pride, including through the use of a coherent palette of materials, design features and planting.

Development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan.

The original building was once in use as a cinema which closed its doors in 1966 and has changed very little. The original part of the building's frontage comprises a central recessed main entrance above which is a projecting balcony and either side of the main entrance are large display windows recessed between two brick piers, above which are smaller first floor windows. The building is very much characterised by its symmetrical appearance, vertically recessed openings and fenestration pattern.

The proposed extension whilst symmetrical in its opening positions would have a flat frontage with no design features or any relationship to the original frontage as such. The proposed extension would obscure and therefore eradicate the character of the building.

In addition, the ground floor windows by reason of their size and position within the elevation would introduce a visually horizontal element which would not relate to the strong vertical frontage which characterises the building.

It is therefore considered the proposed development would be intrusive and discordant within the streetscene and would be harmful and would neither be in keeping with or complement the character of the existing building.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies EN1/2, EN1/8 and the principles of the NPPF.

Heritage

The site lies outside but within the setting of the Conservation Area. The proposal has therefore been assessed for its effect on the significance, character and appearance of the Conservation Area, having regard to the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the heritage policies of the NPPF.

Chapter 20 policy HE4:Securing the conservation of heritage assets of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:

- a. Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and
 - b. Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.
- Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification.

Policy HE9 of the NPPF states that development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should:

- a. Retain and conserve buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area where possible; and
- b. Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.

The application building is within the setting of the conservation area and although its contribution to its setting is not significant due to its contemporary design and materials it does possess a symmetry and visual uniformity. The proposed front extension would alter this, visually truncating the front elevation of the building at first floor level, that possesses strong verticality by virtue of a discordant, visually horizontal single storey addition to the front of the building.

The application is not accompanied by a Heritage Assessment.

As such the proposal does not accord with the principles of the NPPF and therefore cannot be supported in terms of heritage conservation.

Highways

The proposed extension would project 750m forwards of the front elevation.

The proposed floor plan indicates the extension would be within the site although this is not sufficiently detailed on the proposed plan nor shown within the context of the red edge application site.

The Highway Authority have been consulted and the application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that the proposed extension at the front of the building will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the adjacent adopted highway or visibility to the left on egress from the existing car park access.

JP-C2 - Digital connectivity

Policy JP-C2 states this development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting. The policy supports the provision of free, secure, high-speed public wi-fi connections, particularly in the most frequented areas.

The applicant has submitted a statement that the area/local properties currently has fibre broadband as such the property will have a possible download speed of 67Mb up to 74Mb which would be suitable for a small business.

The proposal would comply with JP-C2.

JP-S2 - Carbon and energy

The applicant has submitted a statement that the development would consider efficient heating systems, enhanced construction methods and materials and adopt a 'fabric first' approach to energy efficiency.

The proposed development would comply with JP-S2.

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: Approve with Conditions

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that the proposed extension at the front of the building will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the adjacent adopted highway or visibility to the left on egress from the existing car park access. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies EN1/2, JP-C5 and JP-C8.
- 2 The design of the proposed extension would introduce a discordant and intrusive addition which is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the character of the existing building and which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the policies EN1/2, EN1/8 and policy DP3 of the NPPF.
- 3 The proposed development by virtue of its design would adversely disrupt the visual uniformity of the building and introduce jarring and incongruous features which would have a harmful and unacceptable impact on the setting of the Ramsbottom Conservation Area. The proposal would neither preserve or enhance the traditional character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflict with the following policies: EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 Conservation Area Control, JP-P2 and policies HE4 and HE9 of the NPPF.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT	3/9/26	HL	04.09.26