

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 26/02/2026	Ref: 72639/FUL
Registration: 20/01/2026	LDfC: 18/02/2026	Expiry Date: 17/03/2026
Site Visit: 10/02/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey extensions to front/side

Location: The Stables, Arthur Lane, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 5PN

Description

The application relates to a recently constructed detached single storey dwelling on the west side of Arthur Lane. The property was built on the site of a stable block of similar proportions that was demolished during conversion works in 2020. The site, includes a small curtilage is accessed from Arthur Lane via a single track driveway which terminates in a turning head and parking. The site is enclosed by a mixture of post and wire fencing and mature hedging along the western boundary.

The site is located within the open countryside to the west of Ainsworth Village and is designated Green Belt, West Pennine Moors and is a Special Landscape Area.

It is proposed to add a single storey, pitch roof extension on the east side of the existing house. The extension would have a footprint measuring 6.7m by 4m and accommodate an additional bedroom and en-suite. It would be finished in a render with a slate roof to match the main building.

There would also be flat roof porch added on the north elevation measuring 4.49m by 1.85m. The porch would be finished in facing brick.

Relevant Planning History

60784 - Change of use of stable to dwelling with single storey extension - Approved with Conditions - 25/01/2017

63321 - Change of use of stable to dwelling and single storey extension at side with subterranean accommodation and window/door modification - Approved with Conditions 21/11/2018

65373 - Demolition of existing stable building and erection of 1 no. dwelling - Approved Conditions 18/06/2020

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 27/01/2026.

One objection from the Ainsworth Community Association, stating that the proposal represents a further residential incursion into the green belt and should be refused.

Two comments in support of the proposal have been received, stating that there would be no impact on green belt.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions - N/A

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
EN1/1	Visual Amenity
EN9/1	Special Landscape Areas
OL7/2	West Pennine Moors

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.

Green Belt - The application is accompanied by a supporting statement. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 149, states that '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' is not considered to constitute inappropriate development.

Places for Everyone Policy JP-SP1: Sustainable Development is relevant and seeks to use as much as possible of suitable previously-developed (brownfield) land and vacant buildings.

In terms of volume added to the existing dwelling, this application seeks to add 35%.

It is relevant to note that the previous scheme, involving the rebuilding and converting the original stable block after it was demolished in 2020, added 35% volume to the original stable block volume. Because of its green belt location and this additional volume, permitted development rights were removed by a condition of the approval (65373) so further additions could be strictly controlled.

Whilst there is maybe room for a small extension at the side of the property, the proposal is considered too big and, in relation to the porch too intrusive, would have a detrimental impact on the character and openness of the green belt in this location. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, UDP and Places for Everyone Policies OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt, H2/3

Visual amenity - Whilst the extension projecting off the east side of the property appears to continue the footprint and roofline, the porch on the north side appears rather 'clunky' and incongruous on what is the principle elevation.

The proposal, in terms of visual amenity, is not acceptable and would conflict with UDP Policies H2/3 Extensions and Alterations, EN1/1 Visual Amenity, EN1/9 Special Landscape Areas and OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt and associated guidance in SPDs 6 and 8.

Residential amenity - Given the distance to the nearest neighbour, there are no residential amenity issues arising.

Public comments - The public comments received have been addressed in the above report.

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: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

DELEGATED REPORT

- 1 The proposed extensions would, by reason of size, position and design, be a prominent additions to existing property and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
H2/3 Alterations and Extensions
EN1/1 Visual Amenity
OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt
Development Control Policy Guidance Notes: SPD6 Extensions and alterations and SPD 8 New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
Tom Beirne	26/02/2026		