

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 29/09/2025	Ref: 72290/FUL
Registration: 11/08/2025	LDfC: 29/09/2025	Expiry Date: 06/10/2025
Site Visit: 09/09/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey extension at front/side and two storey rear extension;
Replacement/alteration to existing windows/doors, rendering of existing dwelling and replacement of existing gate

Location: 1A Rowlands Road, Summerseat, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL9 5NF

Description

The application relates to an detached dwelling with a detached garage, which is located off Rowlands Road. Both the dwelling and the garage are set well back from the highway and are virtually unseen due to the large trees surrounding the site. There is a driveway at the front with parking for several cars. There are 2 metre high fences to boundaries at the front and rear of the garage with dense hedges and trees along as well. The rear gardens of surrounding properties are adjacent to the site but these are unseen from site due to the dense boundary treatment and differences in levels in the land. The dwelling is constructed on a hill side and is two storeys at the front and three storeys at the rear.

The site is surrounded by residential properties.

Planning permission was granted in May 2025 for the erection of a single storey extension at the front and side, a single storey rear extension at lower ground level with a balcony/terrace above and render to all elevations.

The proposed development involves the erection of a single storey extension at front/side and two storey rear extension; Replacement/alteration to existing windows/doors, rendering of existing dwelling and replacement of existing gate.

The difference from the previously approved scheme includes the deletion of the balcony at the rear and its replacement with a two storey rear extension. The existing access and driveway would remain as existing.

Relevant Planning History

53873 - Extension to garage with pitched roof at 1A Rowlands Road, Summerseat.
Approved with conditions - 19 May 2011.

71815 - Single storey front/side extension; Single storey rear extension with balustrade balcony; Rear juliette balcony; Render to all elevations at 1A Rowlands Road, Summerseat.
Approved with conditions - 29 May 2025.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 5 September 2025.
There has been no response.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None required.

Pre-start Conditions - Applicant/Agent [Not relevant/has/has not] agreed with pre-start conditions

Development Plan and Policies

OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
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 - 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, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. '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 149 of the NPPF regards the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate development. Exceptions to this are:

- 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) 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, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - i. not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - ii. not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.
- 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 - New Buildings in the Green Belt states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for agriculture and forestry; essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings provided that this would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling; and limited infilling in existing villages as set out under Policy OL1/3.

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.

A plan showing the existing and proposed volumes for the proposed development has been submitted. A 33% extension to the existing dwelling would equate to 192.5 cubic metres and the proposed extensions would have a volume of 155.32 cubic metres. As such, the proposed development would be less than 33% in terms of volume. Also, the proposed development is surrounded by dwellings and the proposed extension would not have an adverse impact upon the openness or character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact upon the Green Belt and would be in accordance with Policy OL1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, SPD8 and 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.

Proposed front and side extension - The proposed front and side extension has been designed to accommodate the existing detached garage and is of a simple, unobtrusive and modern design. The proposed extension would be constructed from timber cladding and would have a flat roof with a parapet detail and a rooflight. Given its location, the proposed extension would be acceptable and would complement the existing dwelling.

The proposed single storey extension would not project excessively from the front elevation of the dwelling, or interfere with the architectural features of the dwelling. The proposed windows are considered to be suitably aligned, and the extension would not overwhelm the dwelling or result in the over development of the associated residential amenity space.

Proposed rear extension and balcony/terrace - The proposed two storey rear extension would be located entirely to the rear of the property. As with the front extension a flat roof is proposed, which would be located below the bedroom window on the rear elevation. The proposed extension is of a simple and unobtrusive design and as such would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling.

Proposed render to elevations - There are a mixture of materials within the immediate street scene including brick, stone and render on the rear of one dwelling. Whilst render is not a feature within the street scene due to the existing mix of materials, the use of render is considered to be acceptable in this instance and would not detract from the character of the area.

It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling, neighbouring properties or street scene and as such complies with Policies H2/3 and OL1/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD 6.

Residential amenity - SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

- There would be 14 metres from the proposed rear extension to the boundary of the garden. This would exceed the aspect standard of 7 metres.
- Given the distance of 14 metres and the dense vegetation along the boundary with No. 24 Crosfield Avenue, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of No. 24 Crosfield Avenue.
- There would be 13 metres between the habitable room windows on the rear of Queens Place and the proposed two storey rear extension, which would comply with the 13 metre aspect standard.
- There would be 10 metres from the proposed front and side extension to the rear boundary and 11.7 metres to the front boundary. This would exceed the aspect standard of 7 metres and would be acceptable.

Therefore, the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact upon the

amenity of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

Parking - SPD11 states that the parking standards for a 4 bedroom dwelling in zone 4 is 3 spaces, 4 cycle spaces in a secure, covered area.

The proposed development can accommodate 3 parking spaces and there would be space within the existing garage for cycle storage for 4 bikes. As such, the proposed development would comply with the maximum standards. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policies H2/3 and HT2/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6 and SPD11.

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

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively and positively to issue the decision without delay. 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 RG404/EX01 C, RG404/EX02 B, RG404/PL01 A, RG404/PL02 B, RG404/PL03 B, RG404/V01 A 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>
HL - 29/09/2025			