

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 24/09/2025	Ref: 71949/FUL
Registration: 08/08/2025	LDFC: 19/09/2025	Expiry Date: 03/10/2025
Site Visit: 16/09/2025	Site Notice: 02/09/2025	Press Date: 28/08/2025
Objections: 0	Con Area:	Adv Type: ALB
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Replace existing windows with UPVC woodgrain windows; change window to ground floor front & side elevation to glazed door, addition of window to first floor rear elevation and increase size of window to existing ground floor rear elevation. Upgrade house insulation to improve thermal performance which will need side gable recessed bay to be insulated and rendered white externally

Location: Bast House Cottage, 335 Manchester Road, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL9 5LZ

Description

The application relates to a detached two storey stone built house between Bast House to the north west and a group of former agricultural buildings recently converted to residential. The property is a grade two listed building dating from the early 18th Century.

The proposal involves replacing the existing windows, adding an additional window to rear elevation and changing the size of a window, also at the rear. The scheme also includes changing an existing window to door to front and side elevations.

The scheme also includes the installation of thermal insulation to side elevation recessed gable and a white exterior render finish (currently existing exterior wall painted white brick).

Relevant Planning History

48281 - Listed building consent for replacement of brick and rough cast with natural stone; rear porch; rain cover canopy; and new windows in replacement stone work - Approve with Conditions 15/08/2007

62862 - Detached double garage with wc - Approve with Conditions 16/07/2018

71336 - Replacement of existing sections of flat roof with pitched roof - Approve with Conditions 23/12/2024

71337 - Listed building consent for replacement of existing sections of flat roof with pitched roof - Approve with Conditions 23/12/2024

71950 - Listed Building Consent to replace existing windows ; change window to ground floor front & side elevation to glazed door, addition of window to first floor rear elevation and increase size of window to existing ground floor rear elevation. Upgrade house insulation to improve thermal performance which will need side gable recessed bay to be insulated and rendered white externally - Undecided

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 22/08/2025. Press and site notices posted. No objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer - Concerns relating to impact of alterations including new and replacement windows. Recommends refusal - see report below.

Pre-start Conditions - N/A

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
EN2/3	Listed Buildings
EN1/1	Visual Amenity
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage

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.

Need - Improving the thermal insulation at the property is clearly beneficial and in line with government policy. However any alterations along these lines need to be sensitive and not harm the character or significance of the heritage asset.

Heritage Policy Background - The application building is a Grade II listed building, described on the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) as –*“Probably early C18. Stone, right-hand end having brick buttressing and gable, the whole evidently once being part of larger house. Two storeys. Two windows with drip mould (right-hand one three-light with renewed stone mullions with labels, left-hand one with round-headed lights and a label, but first floor left-hand one blind and probably a date-panel). Other round-headed and mullioned windows on side walls. Slate roof. Later rear wing”*.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states: In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF states in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states 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 213 of the NPPF states any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

b) 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.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Listed Building - It is accepted that the building is in a sustainable occupied residential use.

Windows - The replacement of the existing timber window frames, although not original, with UPVC windows would not be appropriate on this listed building. Plastic windows are not historically accurate and currently plastic frames cannot achieve the desired level of historicism with regards to design, detailing, moulding and profile and appearance and colour that would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of a listed building.

The existing timber windows would offer a greater level of historicism than plastic windows and as such would at least preserve the current level of architectural and historic interest. No condition report or survey of the window frames has been submitted to justify their wholesale replacement. Even non-historic windows, especially when constructed from timber, should be assessed for repair in the first instance.

The applicants' heritage statement does not constitute a statement of significance describing the significance of the asset affected by the proposed development as required by paragraph 207 of the NPPF.

The proposal to enlarge window openings, replace window openings with new entrances and the addition of a window to a non-habitable laundry room would have the potential to harm the legibility of the building which contributes to the understanding of its significance and therefore might harm any significance that has been identified. There has been no significance identified by the heritage statement or that a very low level of significance exists.

External Render - The proposed rendered external wall insulation system (EWI) to the south east gable would represent an incongruous feature on the building, even though it is already painted white. Painted brickwork is not an historic feature of the period of the building and as such is inappropriate and should ideally be returned to bare brick. The additional cladding (EWI) and render, although sited in the recessed part of the gable would be incongruous and contemporising, causing a loss of architectural interest. The application states that internal alterations are to be carried out. No details of the internal works have been provided and have not been included in the listed building consent application documents or its description.

The proposal in its current form would cause harm to the significance of the listed building. This harm is considered to constitute less than substantial harm within the terms of the NPPF and as such requires a balancing of the harm identified against the public benefits of the proposal. No public benefit has been identified by the applicant and it is considered that as a private residence in sustainable use there would be no public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

In terms of heritage conservation it is recommended that application is refused due to the inappropriate design and materials such as the EWI and plastic windows. The application also lacks information about certain elements of the proposed scheme identified, the lack of a substantive description of significance as required by paragraph 207 of the NPPF.

Alternatively the application should be withdrawn and pre-application negotiations take place to achieve a mutually agreed appropriate scheme.

Visual amenity - The impact on visual amenity is partly addressed in the above 'heritage' comments. The 'knock on' effect of the inappropriate materials and design treatment to the building would have a detrimental impact on the wider setting and the building's appearance within the locality. Whilst public views are limited, there is a public footpath that runs past the site. The proposal would be inappropriate in terms of design and appearance and would be contrary to UDP Policies EN1/1 Visual amenity, H2/3 Extensions and Alterations and associated guidance.

Residential amenity - There are no residential amenity issues arising from the proposal.

Summary - Any improvements to insulation, either to walls or windows, need to take account of the significance of any heritage value to a property and it is considered that, in this case, this has not been done sufficiently. As such it is recommended that the application is refused for the reasons set out below.

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed alterations would have a serious and detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the listed building and cause harm to its significance in terms of heritage. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2 Heritage and UDP Policies and guidance EN1/1 Visual Amenity, EN2/3 Listed Buildings and H2/3 Extensions and Alterations, SPD6 Alterations and Extensions.
- 2 The application contains insufficient information with particular regard to identifying the significance as required by paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2 Heritage and UDP Policy EN2/3 Listed Buildings.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
Tom Beirne	24/09/2025	DM -	26/09/2025