

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 08/09/2026	Ref: 73279/FUL
Registration: 04/08/2026	LDfC: 27/08/2026	Expiry Date: 29/09/2026
Site Visit: 02/09/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIOT

Proposal: Single storey front extension

Location: Starmount Residential Home, Browns Road, Radcliffe, Bolton, BL2 6RG

Description

The application relates to a detached two storey nursing home located off Browns Road. The premises has been extensively extended as set out within the site history below. The site is accessed via a driveway that leads from Browns Road and parking is provided to the front and rear of the premises.

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey front extension that runs along the front elevation of the property, and would tie in with the existing single storey side/front extension that is presently used as a dining area. The proposed extension would be flat roof in design and incorporate roof lanterns.

Relevant Planning History

18057 - Two storey extension at side - Approve 13/03/1986

32503 - Non-illuminated freestanding business sign - Approve 19/12/1996

41785 - Two storey extensions at side and rear to existing nursing home - Approve with Conditions

46602 - Single storey extension at side - Approve with Conditions 23/08/2006

48939 - Single storey extension to north elevation - Refused

52715 - Single storey extensions to form dining room/sun lounge and laundry; Alterations to car parking layout; Bin store - Approve with Conditions 06/08/2010

53411 - Two Storey side and single storey front extensions - Approve with Conditions 13/01/2011

Publicity

Letters sent to neighbouring properties 05/08/2026. No representations received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Condition requested in relation to ensuring that construction materials are provided within the curtilage of the property.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No comments to make regarding contaminated land or air quality.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

CF3/1	Residential Care Homes and Nursing Homes
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P6	Health
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
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), 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.

Principle

UDP Policy CF3/1 states that residential care homes will be located in residential areas and will be permitted where they do not conflict with the amenity of adjoining areas.

PfE Policy JP-P6 confirms improvements in health facilities will be supported, responding to the changing needs and demands of both existing and new residents, including where appropriate, the provision of new or improved health facilities as part of new developments proportionate to the additional demand that they would generate.

NPPF Policy HC4 confirms that consideration weight should be given to the benefits where new or improved public service infrastructure or community facilities would be provided, and development proposals would make a demonstrable contribution towards promoting good health, preventing ill-health, reducing health inequalities or supporting social interaction in the local community.

The site is an existing care home. The floor plans indicate that the proposed extension would create additional floor space for the main lounge area, and an enlarged entrance/link to the existing dining room. No supporting statement has been submitted with the application to confirm why this additional floor space is required, or how this would respond to the needs or demands of existing/new residents. Whilst the improvement of health facilities are acceptable in principle it is unclear in this instance how the proposal would meet the policy considerations set out above.

Visual Amenity

UDP Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that development proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of a particular area. PfE Policy JP-P1 aims to promote a series of beautiful, healthy and varied places. NPPF Policy DP3 confirms that Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Starmount Villa appears on the 1848 and 1893 map of the area, with the latter showing a detached bay fronted property associated with Bradley Fold Print Works. This detached, bay fronted building continues to be depicted on later maps where the print works is referred to as Starmount Print Works and is retained following the demolition of these industrial buildings. Previous applications at the site described the building as a brick built, Georgian style property.

It is acknowledged that the property has been extensively extended to accommodate the existing care home use, and at some point the original building appears to have been rendered obscuring the quoin and window surround detailing previously indicated on elevation drawings of the building. The building therefore has lost much of its original character. The front elevation however, with the exception of the addition of a front porch and the render, appears to remain relatively unaltered in terms of window openings and alignment and in particular retains the two bay windows that can clearly be identified on the footprint of the building in 1893. It should also be noted that whilst extensions to the property have been extensive the extent of the original building and its frontage is still clearly visible and contributes to the visual amenities of the area.

Whilst the proposed extension would tie in with existing extensions at the property it is considered that the proposed extension projects excessively from the front elevation, and would obscure the remaining original features of the host building. The proposed extension would be a dominating, and out of character addition to the front of the building that would be visible from public vantage points at the entrance to the site. The addition of a further front porch element would further emphasis this extension. The proposed addition would lead to the loss of the bay windows, and would prevent the perception of the extent of the original building. In addition, the proposed ground floor windows do not reflect the alignment, or the style of the host building and would conflict with the rhythm of the openings that are presently visible within the frontage of the original building, and later extensions.

It is considered that the design of the proposed extension is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with the Policy considerations set out above.

Amenity

UDP Policy EN1/2 considers the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding area. There are no adopted aspect standards for extensions to non-residential properties however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 (SPD6) provides guidance on aspect standards between in relation to householder extensions and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case.

The nearest residential property is located approximately 22 metres to the south of the proposed extension, which exceeds the 6.5 metres required by SPD 6.

Access

UDP Policy EN1/2 requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access, parking and service provision. PfE Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 require streets to be well designed and managed to make a significant positive contribution to the quality of place and support high levels of walking, cycling and public transport. UDP Policy HT5/1 encourages the provision of satisfactory access for the mobility impaired and those with special needs.

It is unclear if the amended access, would be level and fit for purpose. No equality impact assessment has been provided to confirm that the proposed access and layout would be suitable for the proposed end users.

Carbon And Energy

PfE Policy JP-S2 sets out the steps required to achieve net zero carbon emissions. An energy assessment has been undertaken of the proposed scheme in-line with the energy hierarchy. These calculations illustrate a reduction in CO2 emissions over the baseline of Part L of the building regulations.

Digital Connectivity

PfE Policy JP-C2 requires development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting. The applicant has confirmed that the area/local properties currently has fibre broadband.

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

DELEGATED REPORT

has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The design of the proposed extension is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Policy JP-P1 - Sustainable Places of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework and NPPF (August 2026) Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places.
- 2 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed extension would respond to the needs, demands and access requirements of existing/future residents. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Unitary Development Plan Policies CF3/1 - Residential Care Homes and Nursing Homes, HT5/1 - Access For Those with Special Needs , Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Policy JP-P6: Health and NPPF (August 2026) Policy HC4: HC4: Proposals for new and improved community facilities, public service infrastructure and development providing public health benefits.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP	08/09/2026	DM	08.09.26