

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 26/11/2025

Ref:72237/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 06/10/2025

LDfC: 28/10/2025

Expiry Date: 01/12/2025

Site Visit: 07/11/2025

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: NONE

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: First floor front/side extension with cladding

Location: 5 Stonedolph Close, Ainsworth, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 5SH

Description

The application relates to a previously extended two storey detached house situated at the head of a small cul-de-sac. Most of the front of the site is paved for parking and access to the main entrance of the dwelling. There is also an area of lawn to the side of the property and other planting. To the rear of the dwelling is a large private garden area.

Planning permission was previously granted at this property for a similar development, which is almost complete. Building works appear to have ceased pending the result of the current planning application. The only difference between the previously approved development and the newly proposed one is the orientation of the pitched roof to the extension. Everything else would remain as previously approved.

The proposal is to build a first floor extension to the front/side of the existing dwelling which would create further living space to bedroom 3 of the existing dwelling, to be used by a disabled person living at the property. It would be built over the existing building below and the roof would be pitched. The front and side walls would be clad with Cedar.

Relevant Planning History

- 09/0496 - Commercial use of residential property - 23/10/2009
- 10/0028 - Change of use from residential to a mixed use of residential and office - 18/02/2010
- 53966 - Two storey extension at side/rear and single storey extension at rear - Approve with Conditions 05/07/2011
- 11/0261 - Change of use to office - 13/09/2011
- 54443 - Change of Use from Garage to office (temporary for 12 month only) (Retrospective) - Refused 18/10/2011
- 11/0486 - Change of use to office - 16/01/2012
- 68620 - First floor extension at front/side - Approve with Conditions 09/09/2022

Publicity

2 neighbours notified on 07/10/2025 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
EN9/1	Special Landscape Areas
OL1	Green Belt
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
OL7/2	West Pennine Moors
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
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 and the impact of the development on the designated Green Belt.

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 154 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:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - 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.

Ainsworth village is within the designated Green Belt but it is a heavily populated area sub-suburban setting with many different types of properties. The site is located within a cul-de-sac of other similar properties.

The Green Belt Statement submitted as part of the design and access statement with the application, does not state what the volume increase would be compared to the original property. However, the extension would be a relatively small first floor extension to the front of the property and the footprint of the building would not be increased. The extension would be visible in streetscape along Stonedolph Close and visually it would remain in-keeping with other dwellings along the close.

There would be ample amenity space remaining to the front and rear of the dwelling. As such it is considered that the proposal would not conflict with the surrounding land uses nor would it create harm to the openness of the Green Belt. It is considered therefore that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and it is considered that the proposal complies with UDP Policies OL1/2, 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.

The proposed extension would be built with materials and a design that would be considered in keeping with the existing building. The cladding to the extension and front elevation would be a modern addition. Other buildings on the close are finished with a mixture of brick and render, and a few properties are partially cladded. As such the proposed cedar cladding would be considered acceptable in this location. It is also noted that the cladding was also approved as part of the previous planning application.

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 -

As the property is sited at the head of the cul-de-sac there are no other dwellings directly to the front of the site and there would be no windows installed to the side elevation adjacent to the boundary with no.6 Stonedolph Close next door. In addition, as the extension would be to the first floor only there would be no increase to the footprint of the existing dwelling.

With this in mind the proposal conforms to Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of its impact on residential amenity.

Parking -

The proposal would result in a decrease in the number of bedrooms at the property from 4 to 3 rooms therefore SPD 11 Parking Standards need not be considered. The parking arrangements would remain as existing where there is parking to the drive way to the front of the site.

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 AC-100, AC-102, AC-103, AC-200 and AC-202 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 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 match those of the existing building with the addition of cedar cladding to the extension and front elevation, as noted on the approved drawings.
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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
AU - 26/11/2025		DM - 26/11/2025	