

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda Uhunmwagho	Date of report: 02/09/2026	Ref: 73372/FUL
Registration: 03/07/2026	LDfC: 31/07/2026	Expiry Date: 28/08/2026
Site Visit: 08/07/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: 09/07/2026
Objections: 0	Con Area: HOLC	Adv Type: ARW
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Installation of an electrically operated sliding gate and pedestrian access gate; New stone copings and ball pier caps to entrance pillars

Location: Norcot, Moorbottom Road, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL8 4NS

Description

The application relates to a detached dwelling house located on Moorbottom Road, with vehicle access from Holcombe Old Road. The application site is within Holcombe Village Conservation Area and the dwelling is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). The site is also located within the Green Belt. To the north the dwelling is built right upto Moorbottom Road and there is a public footpath ref 38RAM that runs along the west side of the site and footpath ref 37RAM runs along the south of the site.

The dwelling has been previously extended and there is also a detached barn/garage type structure to the front of the house. At the front of the site there are areas of lawn along with lots of planting and trees. There is a long driveway and parking on site for several vehicles.

The proposal is to install an electrically operated sliding gate and pedestrian access gate at the entrance to the south of the site, along with new stone copings and ball pier caps to entrance pillars.

Relevant Planning History

- 10/0160 - Change of use to building yard - 01/12/2010
- 12/0527 - High fence - 05/11/2012
- 13/0428 - Engineering operation - 03/09/2013
- 13/0580 - Erection of outbuilding - 31/01/2014
- 18/0019 - Alterations to walls and gate - 05/02/2018
- 18/0021 - Sycamore tree has been taken down - 02/02/2018
- 18/0338 - Insertion of window and door in barn gable - 25/02/2019
- 19/0157 - Bridleway being widened - 29/07/2019
- 67490 - Single storey extension - Approve with Conditions 26/10/2021
- 68084 - Single storey side extension - Approve 28/04/2022
- 69736 - Variation of condition no. 2 (approved plans) 68084 - Single storey side extension- Change approved aluminium curtain wall glazing to aluminium glazed roof windows set into grey slate and formation of raised garden area at patio level with steps - Approve with Conditions 27/07/2023
- 02976/E - Proposed alterations to the previously approved single storey extension and site wide matters - Enquiry completed 15/07/2024
- 70980 - Non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 68084 (single storey side extension): New roof windows in the rear roof slope and alterations to the opening to the front elevation - Approve 16/08/2024
- 71573 - Replacement in-fill extension - Approve with Conditions 13/03/2025

Publicity

5 neighbours notified on 06/07/2026 - No comments or objections received.

Site notice erected on 08/07/2026.

Press advert 09/07/2026

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

- Traffic Section - No comments or objections received.
- Conservation Officer - No objections, subject to a condition to provide detail of the design of the gate and materials to be used, this should metal and coloured black and details of the stone coping and finial, stone should be natural stone and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any installation is begun.
- Public Rights of Way Officer - No objections. Informative to be added regarding the public right of way (footpath no.37) which is in the vicinity of the entrance to the site.

Pre-start Conditions - The agent has agreed to the pre-commencement condition as stated below.

Prior to commencement the applicant must provide detail of the design of the gate and materials to be used, this should metal and coloured black and details of the stone coping and finial, stone should be natural stone and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any installation is begun.

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PfE	Places for Everyone
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations

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, as well as on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt, the conservation area and the dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset.

Principle (Green Belt)

Paragraph GB7 - Development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt, of the NPPF states,

1. The following categories of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt, and therefore should not be regarded as harmful to the Green Belt or be required to demonstrate very special circumstances:

- a. Development which is for agriculture, horticulture and forestry, or which is solely for nature conservation, restoration and/or enhancement;
- b. The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the original building 40. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- c. Limited infilling in villages lying within the Green Belt;
- d. Limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in this Framework or the development plan (for instance, on a rural exception site);
- e. The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt;
- f. Certain other forms of development, provided the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is minimised, and there would not be a significant conflict with the Green Belt purposes. These are:
 - i. Mineral extraction and processing, engineering operations, and transport, electricity network, water and telecommunications infrastructure required in a Green Belt location);
 - ii. Development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order;
 - iii. Material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and

iv. The provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments.

g. Development where all of the following apply:

i. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;

ii. There is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed;

iii. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to policy TR3 of this Framework⁴²; and

iv. In the case of major development involving the provision of housing, the development proposed complies with policy GB8.

h. Residential or mixed-use development which would:

i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B);

ii. Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement within which the station is located;

iii. Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure;

iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location; and

v. In the case of proposals for major development, comply with policy GB8.

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.

A heritage statement has been submitted along with the application but no Green Belt calculations. The dwelling on site has been previously extended and as such it is possible any further development at the site would result in an increase of over the recommended 33%. However, the proposal is to rebuild the existing gate posts and install vehicle and pedestrian gates. The gates would be installed within the residential curtilage and would be similar to a gate as Hey House, close to the site. As the only addition would be the gates it is considered that there would not have any detrimental impact on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt.

Heritage/conservation area -

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.

HE4 : Securing the conservation of heritage assets

1. Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:

a. Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can

make to local character and distinctiveness; and

b.Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.

2. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.

3. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision relating to the asset.

4. Proposals for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with other policies in this Framework and/or those in the development plan, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, should be considered on the basis of whether the conservation benefits outweigh the disbenefits of departing from the policies concerned.

Paragraph HE 5 : Assessing effect on heritage assets

1. Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant historic environment record should be referred to in making this assessment, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.

2. Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to:

- a. Have a positive effect, which is where the significance of a heritage asset would be enhanced, or better revealed; or
- b. Have no effect on the significance of a heritage asset; or
- c. Result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance; or
- d. Cause the total loss of the significance of a heritage asset.

3. In making this assessment it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.

4. Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals.

5. Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, a heritage asset with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be undertaken and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be used to help understand the asset's significance and the potential effect of the proposal on this, which should inform the design, mitigation and implementation of the development.

HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets

1. When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.
2. Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported.

3. Any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight, which should be dealt with in accordance with paragraphs 4 to 6 of this policy.
4. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.
5. Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or if all of the following apply:
 - a. The nature of the heritage asset would otherwise prevent all reasonable uses of the site;
 - b. No suitable use for the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;
 - c. Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible; and
 - d. The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the asset back into use.

HE7: Decisions on non-designated heritage assets

1. Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a non-designated heritage asset should be supported.
2. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
3. Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, it should only be supported where the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of the harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

Within this context, development which would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; while development which would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

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.

It is considered that the proposed gates and replacement pillars would be built with materials and a design that would be considered to be in keeping with the dwelling. As such the proposal would be acceptable in this location and would preserve the character of the surrounding conservation area.

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 heritage statement states that the existing pillars at the site entrance are to be rebuilt, so that the one on the west side would be built slightly further away from the telegraph pole located at the entrance to the site. This would be so that the ball pier caps could be installed and seen in their entirety. There would be new stone copings and ball pier caps will be fixed in position and the new pedestrian and sliding vehicle gates would be fabricated from steel rails and bars, and coated black. These would be similar to the existing balcony railings on the main dwelling.

The proposed design and finished materials would be considered to be in keeping with the main dwelling, and as stated in the heritage statement their appearance would be similar to gates at the entrance to Hey House to the southwest of the site.

Taking the above into account the design of the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the main building on site and 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 -

The existing vehicular access to the site would not be widened. The only change to the opening would be the addition of the new gate. As the gate would slide behind the existing boundary wall, within the site it would not cause any obstruction to the footpath/highway in front and as such would not have any significantly detrimental impact on passing pedestrians and/or traffic.

The new pedestrian gate would be installed in the existing front corner of the boundary wall and it would open inwards on to the site and not on to the public footpath to the front of site. The installation of the new gates at Norcot would not have any significant detrimental effect 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 separation distance to the surrounding properties.

Public Footpath -

Public footpath number 37, Ramsbottom provides access to the edge of the property from Holcombe Old Road. The public rights of way officer has no objections to the proposal but has requested that the following should be added to the decision notice for information,

The applicant must be made aware of the need to safeguard people using public rights of way and that no public rights of way are damaged, widths altered (without permission), gates erected across their width (unless authorised by Bury Council the Highway Authority) or obstructed by any other means either during or as a result of development. The applicant must ensure that no changes to land levels/surface water runoff affects a public right of way. If a temporary obstruction of public rights of way is unavoidable, no development must take place until a temporary closure order has been made by Bury Council and a suitable temporary alternative route(s) made available. This would be added as an informative.

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 way 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 drawings numbered DLP1-00, DLP1-01, DLP1-02 and DLP1-03 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 Unitary Development Plan and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.
- 3 Details/Samples of the (materials/bricks) to be used in the construction of the electrically operated sliding gate and pedestrian access gate, new stone copings and ball pier caps to entrance pillars, together with details of their manufacturer, type/colour and size, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced. Only the approved materials/bricks shall be used for the construction of the development.
Reason. No material samples have been submitted and are required in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to UDP Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
AU - 02/09/2026		HL 02.09.2026	