

DELEGATED REPORT**Report by** Amanda**Date of report:** 26/02/2026**Ref:**72611/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 01/12/2025**LDfC:** 02/01/2026**Expiry Date:** 26/01/2026**Site Visit:** 13/01/2026**Site Notice:** N/A**Press Date:** N/A**Objections:** 1**Con Area:** N/A**Adv Type:** NONE**Reason for Delay:****EIA:** NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL**Stat Class:** HOUS**Proposal:** Two Storey Rear Extension**Location:** 3 Carr Bank, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9DQ**Description**

The application relates to a mid-terrace cottage with a garden to the front and a yard to the rear. There is no on site parking. Parking is available to land to the southeast of the site, where there are spaces for several vehicles and a couple of garages. It is unclear who owns this land but it appears that it is used by the residents of the cottages known as Carr Bank and possibly the bungalow to the rear. Access to the rear of the site is via steps up from the road/parking area. The path services the rear of numbers 1 to 5 Carr Bank and there is a small area of open land to the opposite side of the path.

The site has a stone wall to all boundaries of the rear yard and an area of land outside of the wall. The proposal is to build a two storey rear extension to provide an extended kitchen at ground floor level and a bedroom at first floor. It would project a maximum of 2932.5mm and it would measure 3905mm wide at ground floor level. On the north side the first floor projection would be 1330mm and the northern corner of the extension would be chamfered at a 45° angle. The north side elevation would be approximately 330mm away from the existing stone boundary wall. The first floor would project 2932.5mm on the southern side and the roof would be hipped.

The site is not in the Green Belt or a conservation area and it is not on the local list or a listed building.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity3 neighbours notified on 09/12/2025 - One objection received.

- They have concerns about rainwater pipes and that the extension would result in more overflow/flooding on to their land.
- The extension would restrict light to the rear of their property.
- It would be an eyesore and would be detrimental to their enjoyment of their rear yard.
- It would prevent wind flow across the rear of the properties which would mean clothes wouldn't dry properly.
- The extension would cause overshadowing to windows at their property.
- The existing boundary wall has no foundations and would be unsuitable to be built upon.
- They would support an extension for a single bed room, rather than a double.

The objector was notified of revised drawings on 13/02/2026 - further comments received

on 18/02/2026.

- The latest drawing you received might not be updated.
- They suggested the room should be made into a single room. It is still a double.
- No objection to the ground floor but they feel the size of the first floor section should be reduced.

Further comments received from the objector on 19/02/2026 following receipt of a further revised floor plan -

- They reiterate that the projection of the extension should be reduced to 2100mm to incorporate a single bedroom, rather than a double.
- The projection on the north side should be reduced to 1000mm so it would satisfy the requirements of SPD 6, Paragraph 5.2 (two storey rear extensions).
- The objector provided sketches to support their objection which have been added to the application file.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
PFE	Places for Everyone

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.

The main considerations of this application are the impact of the proposal on visual and residential amenity.

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.

Although not an ideal in terms of design, the chamfered corner of the extension would satisfy the requirements as set out in SPD 6 with regard to impact on residential amenity at the neighbouring property. The extension would be to the rear of the existing dwelling and as such would only be readily visible by the immediate neighbours. As such it would not have any significant detrimental impact on the character of the existing streetscene.

The walls of the extension are to be rendered. Although a stone finish might be preferable on this property the extension would be to the rear of the house and the site is located within an area where there are many different designs and ages of properties. Some of which are rendered. As such the render finish would be considered acceptable in this location.

Given the above the proposal conforms to Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of visual amenity, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

Residential Amenity -

- There are no residential properties directly to the rear of the site.
- The drawings show that all of the development would be within the residential curtilage of the site and as such there would be no encroachment on to neighbouring land or air space.
- The rear of the extension would be approximately 6000mm away from the rear boundary.
- The south side elevation would be approximately 2350mm away from the shared boundary with no.1 Carr Bank and there would be no windows in this side elevation.
- To the north the extension would be approximately 330mm away from the shared boundary wall with no.5 Carr Bank and there would be no windows to this side

elevation.

- The extension would have an overall projection of 2932.5mm from the original rear elevation of the dwelling, which would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6 at ground level.
- At first floor level, on the north side of the extension the side elevation would project 1330mm from the rear wall and it would be 330mm away from the shared boundary with no.5 Carr Bank. As there are no extensions to the rear of no.5 the 45° rule needs to be applied. This means at the 1330mm mark the wall of the extension would be chamfered away from the shared boundary with no.5 at a 45° angle. This would ensure the position and projection of the extension would not have any significant detrimental effect on residential amenity to windows on the rear of no.5 Carr Bank, and its rear yard.
- The two storey element would project the whole 2932.5mm on the southern side but as the extension would be built well away from the shared boundary with no.1 and the site is due north of that property, there would not be any significant detrimental effect on residential amenity at that property.
- The flat roof section to the rear corner of the ground floor section would not have any detrimental impact on residential amenity at neighbouring properties.

The proposal conforms to UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of the 45° rule from nearest relevant window of the adjacent property.

Parking -

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 2 to 3 and SPD6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered. This can then require the proposal to provide a maximum of 2 parking spaces. There is no existing parking within the site but it appears the applicant has access to a parking area to the south of the site. This would remain the same once the extension would be built. In this instance then the parking arrangements are considered sufficient

Revised drawings received on 24/02/2026 and 25/02/2026 -

Further revised drawings were received reducing the projection of the first floor section along the northern boundary to 1330mm. The objector was not notified of the drawings as the revisions would satisfy requirements as set out in SPD 6 in terms of residential amenity at the adjacent dwellings.

Response to neighbour objection -

Most of the comments from the objector have been addressed in the visual and residential amenity sections of the report above.

They did point out that the applicant's have a third bedroom in the loft and this is not shown on the existing or proposed drawings. Following discussion with the agent they confirmed that there is a loft room but given the staircase is very steep the room is only used for storage. They advised this area was not surveyed with regards to the planning application.

It is noted that even if the room was currently used as a bedroom it would be highly unlikely to affect the outcome of this application.

The neighbour has made some suggestions as to how the extension could be revised in order to address their concerns. The impact on the neighbours has been addressed in the report above and by way of revised drawings which reduced the size of the extension compared to the originally submitted drawings.

Another concern is regards rain water goods and that the position of the extension would result in flooding/over flow on to their rear yard. Although the agent has not shown any rain water goods on the drawings the side elevation would be approximately 330mm off the shared boundary with no.5 Carr Bank and around 2350mm away from the shared boundary with no.1. As such any rain water goods would not encroach on to neighbouring land and

should drain via the applicant's site only. This would be addressed as part of the Building Control application.

Although algae and lichen is a concern in terms of people slipping, it would not be considered to be a planning consideration and as such would not impact the decision.

The impact on light has been addressed in the report as has the impact on the kitchen and bathroom windows to the rear of the attached dwelling.

The neighbour has also advised that they would not support any part of the extension being built off their wall. The plans show that all of the extension would be built away from both north, south and east boundary walls.

Conclusion -

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity and conforms to the Bury Unitary Development Plan Policy Nos EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/3 – Extensions and Alterations and the Development Control Policy Guidance Note 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

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 TDS-25-196-01, TDS-25-196-02 and TDS-25-196-02.5 received on 02/12/2025, drawing numbered TDS-24-196-03 received on 24/02/2026 and drawings numbered TDS-25-196-04 and TDS-25-196-04.5 received on 25/02/2026 as modified by the emails from Thorp Design Services Ltd dated 24/02/2026 and 25/02/2026. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of visual amenity, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.
- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall be light grey render to all elevations and pale grey windows.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

DELEGATED REPORT

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
AU - 26/02/2026			