

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 22/10/2025

Ref:72310/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 18/08/2025

LDfC: 22/10/2025

Expiry Date: 13/10/2025

Site Visit: 01/10/2025

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: PI

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with balcony above; Single storey front extension

Location: Holcombe Villa Farm, Turton Road, Tottington, Bury, BL8 3QG

Description

The application relates to a large previously extended, two storey dwelling on Turton Road, Tottington. It is located within the designated Green Belt and is part of the West Pennine Moors. There is a large parking area to the front of the site with gardens to three sides. The site has stone boundary walls and there is a wall separating the front of the site from the rear garden.

The proposal is to add a single storey front extension and a single storey rear extension with a balcony above. At the front the extension would be built on the northwest side of the front elevation. It would project to the same point as the existing front window and then 3.35m to the side. The roof would be pitched to match the existing front extension and there would be 6 full length windows to the front and one to the side. The drawing also shows that an existing circular window to the games room above the garage would be replaced with a larger window (2 panes, measuring 2.2m wide).

At the rear the existing single storey extension would be extended a further 2.03m and it would measure 5.18m wide. The balcony above would extend over the whole of the ground floor extension. The extension would be constructed using stone to match the existing dwelling and there would be a glazed balustrade to the side and rear. The extension and balcony would be set in from the side elevation of the main part of the house by around 2.9m.

Relevant Planning History

- 58221 - Lawful development certificate for proposed remodelling of bay window to front and extension to kitchen - Withdrawn - Invalid 23/12/2014
- 58307 - Single storey extension at rear; Extension to existing bay window at front - Approve with Conditions 16/02/2015
- 58583 - Single storey rear extension (Revised Scheme); Extension to existing bay window at front - Approve with Conditions 29/04/2015

Publicity

1 neighbour notified on 10/09/2025 - No comments or objections received.
Site notice erected on 01/10/2025.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

OL1	Green Belt
OL7/2	West Pennine Moors
EN9/1	Special Landscape Areas
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
PFE	Places for Everyone
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.

The main considerations of this application are the impact of the proposal on visual and residential amenity, and the impact on the surrounding Green Belt.

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.

The planning statement included with the application states that the extension would have a volume increase of 50% which would exceed the 33% limit as suggested in SPD 8, however in some locations a larger increase would still be considered acceptable in certain situations.

There are no specific tests on openness set out within the NPPF, and every site would be assessed on its own merits. The site is quite large and the extensions would not project excessively beyond the existing front or rear elevations of the dwelling and all of the development would be within the original residential curtilage.

There are also other properties along Turton Road which have also been previously extended. As such although the extended dwelling would result in a volume increase of 50%, the resulting building would not appear inappropriate in the existing streetscene compared with other properties along Turton Road.

In this instance it is considered that the proposed development would not detrimentally affect the openness of the surrounding Green Belt and the proposal would be considered acceptable in terms of UDP Policies OL1/2, SPD 8 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.

The proposed design and materials used in the construction of the single storey front extension would be similar to the existing single storey front extension on the opposite side of the entrance and as such would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building.

The walls of the single storey rear extension would be constructed from stone to match the existing property and the windows and doors would be similar to other openings on the dwelling. The resulting appearance of the development would be considered to be a contemporary interpretation of a traditional style country/farm house, which would be similar to other properties in the area.

The balcony would be to the rear of the dwelling and would not be openly visible from directly in front of the building. However, it would be partially visible from the highway and fields to the north and west of the site but as it would be set well back from the highway and the extension would be set in from the side elevation it wouldn't be considered to be overly prominent in the streetscene. As such the design of the proposal is considered acceptable in this location.

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, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

Residential Amenity -

- There are no residential properties directly to the front or rear of the site.
- There are no residential properties directly to the west side of the site and as the extensions would be built on the west side of the dwelling there would be no significant

- detrimental impact on residential amenity at no.321 Turton Road to the east.
- The proposed extensions would not have any significant detrimental impact on the existing parking arrangements within the site.
- There would be over 15m from the first floor balcony to the rear site boundary.
- The replacement window to the games room above the garage would not have any significant detrimental impact on residential amenity in the area.
- All of the development would be well within the residential curtilage.

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 front garden and drive.

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 TDS-25-196-01, TDS-25-196-02, TDS-25-196-03, TDS-25-196-04, TDS-25-196-05, TDS-25-196-06, TDS-25-196-07, TDS-25-196-08, TDS-25-196-09, TDS-25-196-10 and TDS-25-196-3.5 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 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 - 22/10/2025		HL - 22/10/2025	

