

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 07/01/2026	Ref: 72333/FUL
Registration: 26/09/2025	LDfC: 29/10/2025	Expiry Date: 21/11/2025
Site Visit: 08/10/2025	Site Notice: 08/10/2025	Press Date: 02/10/2025
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: ARW
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey side extension; Alterations to existing front porch

Location: 1 Bottoms Hall Cottages, Turton Road, Tottington, Bury, BL8 3QB

Description

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling, that makes up a pair of dwellings within the Green Belt. The site access follows public right of way footpath 19TOT . Public right of way footpath 26TOT runs along the rear of the site.

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two storey side extension. The proposed extension would project 5000mm from the side gable of the existing property with an 835mm set back from the principal rear elevation, and a 335mm set back from the principal front elevation. A replacement porch that projects approximately 1575mm from the front elevation of the dwelling is also proposed.

Relevant Planning History

None

Publicity

Letters sent to neighbouring properties 29/09/2025

Site Notices posted 8/10/2025

Advert published in the Bury Times 2/10/2025

No representations received

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Public Rights of Way Officer It appears the paths will not be directly affected. Informative requested in relation to the need to safeguard people using the public rights of way and that no public rights of way should be damaged, altered, obstructed or closed without the relevant application/s.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
OL7/2	West Pennine Moors
EN6/4	Wildlife Links and Corridors
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
RT3/3	Access to the Countryside
RT3/4	Recreational Routes
JP-G9	The Green Belt
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt

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.

Principle (Green Belt)

The site is designated as Green Belt under PfE 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 makes it clear that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of eight exceptions apply:

- a. buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b. the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c. the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d. the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e. limited infilling in villages;
- f. limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g. limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- h. Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
 - i. mineral extraction;
 - ii. engineering operations;
 - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
 - iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
 - v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
 - vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Policy OL1/2 states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development, unless it is for one of more of the following purposes: agriculture and forestry essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings, provided that this would not result in a disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, or, in the case of replacement existing dwellings, the new dwelling is not materially larger than the one it replaces; limited infilling in existing villages.

This is further supported by Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt which state that extensions of existing dwellings should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. To assist in what can be considered to be disproportionate SPD 8 considers additions of up to a third (33%). However, that is not to say something larger, or smaller than 33%, would not be supported as each case is considered on its own merits.

The Green Belt Statement submitted with the application confirms that the existing dwelling

has a volume of approximately 432.19 cubic metres. The proposed side extension has been reduced in size since the submission of this statement however, the plans submitted are to scale and as such the volumes can be calculated. The proposed extension would have a volume of approximately 204 cubic metres and the proposed porch would have a volume of approximately 14 cubic metres. Minus the volume of the porch (approximately 9.6 cubic metres) which is being replaced this would equate to an increase of 208.4 cubic metres or 48 % which exceeds the guidance set out within SPD 6.

The host property is a semi-detached dwelling, and is clearly visible from the adjacent public rights of way. The host dwelling is viewed in the context of the attached dwelling which replicates the building line, and ridge height of the site. This neighbouring property has not been extended to the site.

The proposed extension would be located to the side of the existing property. Due to its overall width, the proposed two storey extension significantly extends the existing two-storey wing. The proposed extension however would have a set back from the principal front and rear elevations of the dwelling, and would have a lower ridge height. Given the wide frontage of the row (host dwelling and neighbouring property), the set back proposed, and the lower ridge height this proposed addition at the end of the building would appear subservient and as such would appear as subordinate to the host dwelling, and the pair of semi-detached properties as a whole.

The proposed porch, would replace an existing porch which is slightly offset. Whilst wider than the existing porch the replacement porch would be sited more centrally within the front elevation of the original property and as such would represent an improvement in the visual amenity of this frontage.

Given the above circumstances, the proposal would not constitute a disproportionate extension to the existing building, would suitably assimilate with the host building and would not have any unacceptable impacts on visual amenity. The proposed extension and porch are therefore considered to comply with Paragraph 154 c of the NPPF.

Visual Amenity

SPD 6 and UDP Policy H2/3 seek to achieve a high standard of design that compliments the original building, and does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of neighbouring properties and the general street scene.

As set out above the scale of the proposed extension is considered to be acceptable. The proposed side extension would not overwhelm the host dwelling, or result in over development of the associated residential amenity space. The windows within the proposed extension are suitably aligned and replicate the window arrangement within the host dwelling. The proposal seeks to restore the original stone work to the front of the property which would represent an improvement over the existing render. The proposed front and side elevations would be constructed from stonework to match this restored stonework. The existing rear elevation would be retained with a render finish and the proposed rear elevation of the extension would replicate this. Matching slate is proposed for the roof of the extension.

The proposed porch would not project excessively from the front elevation and as set out above is sited more centrally within the original front elevation than the existing porch, balancing out this elevation.

Overall, it is considered that the design of the proposed extensions and alterations would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the host dwelling or the surround area and as such would comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of

neighbouring properties.

- Proposed front ground floor and first floor habitable room windows within the side extension would project no further forward than the existing front window arrangement and are located over 7 metres from the directly facing boundary (red edge shown on block plan). As such the proposed front windows would comply with the aspect standards set out within SPD 6.
- The proposed door and window associated with the porch relate to a non-habitable room and as such no aspect standards have been applied.
- The proposed side habitable room first floor, and ground floor windows would not be principal windows and as such aspect standards have not been applied.
- No rear ground floor windows are proposed.
- The proposed first floor rear window would relate to a non-habitable room (shower room) and as such aspect standards not applied.
- The proposed front and rear elevations of the side extension would not project beyond the principal front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling and as such would not have an overbearing impact on the attached dwelling.
- There are no further dwellings to the front, side or rear of the site.
- The proposed porch would replace an existing porch of a similar projection and as such an overbearing impact on the adjacent property is not foreseen.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. 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 development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2 This decision relates to drawings numbered Location Plan 1: 1250, 001 Rev A, Location Plan 1:500, 002 Rev C, Block Plan - Annotated 1:200 received 7th January 2026 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP 7/1/2026		DM 08/01/26	