

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 31/10/2025

Ref:72214/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 08/09/2025

LDfC: 30/09/2025

Expiry Date: 03/11/2025

Site Visit: 30/10/2025

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: AINS

Adv Type: N/A

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Porch to front elevation and alterations to first floor front window with installation of juliet balcony; Single storey side extension

Location: 29 Greenside, Ainsworth, Bolton, BL2 5SF

Description

The application relates to a previously extended detached property with gardens to the front and rear of the site. The site is located within the designated Green Belt. At the front of the site is a driveway for at least two vehicles. There is a low wall along the front boundary and the drive access is open to the unadopted road in front. Opposite the front of the site is Ainsworth Methodist Church. The church and area to the east of the site are located within the Ainsworth Village conservation area, but the site is not.

At the rear there is a private garden accessed via a path to the side of the property. There are fences to all boundaries.

The proposal is to build a new front porch measuring 2.04m x 2.52m. It would have a pitched roof and would be finished with materials to match the existing building. Also the front the existing first floor window is to be replaced with a full length window and Juliet balcony. At the side there would be a single storey extension measuring 2.18m x 4.75m. It would have a pitched roof, doors to the front and rear, and it would be finished with materials to match the existing dwelling.

Relevant Planning History

57008 - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed single storey rear extension - Lawful Development 15/01/2014

61195 - First floor extension at front - Approve with Conditions 03/04/2017

Publicity

3 neighbours notified on 09/09/2025 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer - No objections.

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

OL1 Green Belt

OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt

EN9/1 Special Landscape Areas

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 proposal on the surrounding Green Belt and nearby conservation area.

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 row of other similar properties, some of which have also been extended and modernised.

The Green Belt Statement submitted with the application, concludes that the proposal would result in additions over a third of the original volume of the building. However, the extensions would all take place within the original residential curtilage and there would be ample amenity space remaining to the front and rear of the dwelling. It would also be similar to neighbouring dwellings. As such it is considered that the development would not have any significant detrimental effect on the character or openness of the surrounding Green Belt.

Impact on Conservation Area and Visual Amenity -

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities in the exercise of their planning functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

This is further supported by UDP Policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control that require any development within a Conservation Area to preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the area.

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 site itself is not located within the conservation area, but the road in front and areas opposite are. The conservations officer was consulted and they have no objections to the proposal.

The proposed single storey side extension would be built with materials and a design that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building and as it would be set back from the front elevation it would not have any significant detrimental impact on the character of the existing streetscene.

At the front the new porch would be pitched roof, mirroring the existing first floor extension at the front. It would add a more modern aspect to the front of the property with glazing to the side, and above the entrance door. Similarly the change from a traditional window to a Juliet balcony at first floor level would be a more modern feature on this property. There are not many properties in the area with a Juliet balcony to the front, but the design of the proposal would be considered to be in-keeping with other properties further along Greenside, and overall the existing character of the building would be retained.

Given the above the proposal would not have any significant detrimental effect on the existing streetscene or character of the surrounding area, including the conservation area.

As such 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 single storey side extension would be built well away from the front and rear boundaries and there would be no windows in the side elevation adjacent to the shared boundary with no.27 Greenside to the south.
- There are open fields to the rear of the property.
- Opposite the front of the site is Ainsworth Methodist Church. Although the first floor window style is to be changed the room would remain as a bedroom. The distance from the new window to the church opposite would be sufficient given the church is not a residential property.
- The distance from the new Juliet balcony window to the front boundary would be around 7m, which would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- The proposed porch to the front elevation would not interfere with the existing parking arrangements within the site and the proposed side window would be an acceptable distance from the shared boundary with no.31 next door, specifically as the porch is not classed as a habitable room.

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 separation distance to the surrounding 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 drive at 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 drawing numbered 2949_BOL_01_Planning_Rev_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 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

DELEGATED REPORT

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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
AU -	31/10/2025	DM	31/10/25