

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 20/11/2023

Ref:70158/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 20/10/2023

LDfC: 14/11/2023

Expiry Date: 15/12/2023

Site Visit: 10/11/2023

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: Demolish existing rear extension and replace with single storey rear extension

Location: 6 Riverside Drive, Summerseat, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL9 5QX

Description

The application relates to a 2 storey detached house which has been previously extended to the side and rear. The property is situated within the designated Green Belt but not within the conservation area. There is open land to the rear and Holcombe Brook (water way) runs along the rear of the site.

The proposal is to replace the existing conservatory to the rear of the dwelling with a single storey extension projecting 4m from the original rear elevation and measuring 8.1m wide. The extension would be finished with facing brick and the windows, doors and glazed roof panels would all be black UPVC. Part of the roof would also be tiled to match the main dwelling.

Relevant Planning History

66855 - First floor side extension; Juliet balcony at rear; Roof canopy to front elevation - Approve with Conditions 22/07/2021.

Publicity

Two neighbours notified on 24/10/2023 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

OL1 Green Belt

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

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) and the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) together with other relevant material planning considerations, including relevant policies in the emerging Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

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 Policy 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, as well as the impact on the surrounding Green Belt.

Principle (Green Belt) -

Paragraphs 147 and 148 state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC). Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. VSC 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:
 - 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.

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.

The whole of Summerseat Village is situated within the designated Green Belt. There are many different property size and styles throughout the village, many of which have been previously extended. The agent has provided a brief Green Belt statement in which they advise the proposed extension plus previous additions equate to 33.3% of the original volume of the property.

Notwithstanding the volume calculations, as the site lies within the urban area the general rule of a third increase in volume is less important than the appearance of any development within the streetscape. 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.

As the extension would be to the rear of the property it would not be visible in the general streetscene along Riverside Drive. It would be visible from the rear of both adjacent properties but as the extension would be built with materials and a design that would be considered to be acceptable in this location it would not have any significant detrimental effect in terms of visual amenity.

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.

Residential Amenity -

- There are no residential properties to the rear of the site.
- The extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of no.8 Riverside Drive to the north but there would be glazing to the side elevation facing this property. However, the existing boundary fence and planting would screen most of the views to and from the extension and there are no windows to the side of no.8 facing the site. There is a path to the side of no.8 adjacent to the shared boundary but it is not useable amenity space.
- The extension would project 4m past the rear elevation of no.4 to the south and there would be high level windows only to this side. As such privacy levels would be retained between the two properties.

As such 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.

Parking -

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms therefore SPD 11 Parking Standards need not be considered. The parking arrangements would remain as existing where there is parking to the front of the site.

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 151030723 A received on 11/10/2023 and drawing numbered 151030723 B received on 20/11/2023 as modified by the email from Summit Conservatory Design Ltd dated 20/11/2023. 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.
- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall match those of the existing building.
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 - 20/11/2023		DM	24/11/23