

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 07/10/2026	Ref: 73401/FUL
Registration: 27/08/2026	LDfC: 18/09/2026	Expiry Date: 22/10/2026
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 3	Con Area:	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two-Storey Front Extension; Two-Storey Rear Extension; Two-Storey Side Extension; New Gable Roof Extension at front and Alterations to External Windows/Doors
Location: Gorse Hill Farm, Starling Road, Bury, BL8 2HJ

Description

The application relates to a detached dwelling house located on the junction of Ainsworth Road and Starling Road. Pedestrian access to the site can be gained from Ainsworth Road, whilst vehicular access is gained from Starling Road. The original dwelling has previously been extended at first floor, and at single storey to the side.

The premises has an existing detached garage/outbuilding to the south of the main dwelling.

The site is located within the Green Belt.

Planning permission is sought for the removal of the existing side conservatory and for the the construction of a two storey side extension that projects approximately 5000mm, and a two storey rear extension that projects approximately 6760mm.

To the front it is proposed to construct two new bay windows that project approximately 800m, and a new two storey gable extension to replace the existing porch that projects approximately 1500mm. New full height windows to the front are also proposed.

Planning permission has previously been granted for alterations to the dwelling. This proposal seeks to enlarge projection of the previously approved two storey rear extension by 700mm and to replace the approved single storey side extension that projects 2725mm, with a two storey side extension that projects 5000mm.

Relevant Planning History

21998 - Conversion of existing farm buildings to one dwelling - Approve 09/02/1989

23960 - Conversion and extension of existing farm buildings to form one dwelling - Approve 27/02/1990

24866 - erection of boundary wall and garage/stable block - Approve 06/09/1990

33946- Infilling of land and pond to form access road and hardstanding; construction of gateway - Refuse 19/03/1998

34589 - Prior approval determination - agricultural building for storage of hay and straw - Refuse 07/07/1999

35248 - Erection of stables, hay store and carriage store building - Approve with Conditions

07/07/1999

35247 - Retention of entrance gates and walls - Approve with Conditions 07/07/1999

40426 - First floor extension - Approve with Conditions 31/03/2003

73042 - Two storey front extension; Two storey rear extension; Single storey side extension; New gable roof extension at front and alterations to external windows/doors
- Approve with Conditions 21/05/2026

Publicity

Letters sent to neighbouring properties 28/08/2026.

3 objections received in relation to:

- Original application set out that the proposal would exceed permitted development rights, demonstrating excessive scale.
- Over development of original property
- Site is clearly visible from the entrance along Starling Road.
- Impact and disturbance to wildlife and habitats.
- Harm to the Green Belt
- A two storey 5 metre wide extension is significantly bigger than a 4 x 4 metre conservatory - approximately to 10 x bigger

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
JP-G9	The Green Belt
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
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 (Green Belt)

The site is designated as Green Belt under PfE JP-G9.

NPPF Policy S3 sets out the presumption in favour of development and distinguishes between development within settlements and development outside settlements.

This application site is considered to be located within a settlement, therefore NPPF Policy S4 applies. This states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework.

Policy GB6 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Policy GB6 also states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. '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.

Policy GB7 of the NPPF is clear that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it meets the listed exceptions.

Exception b of Policy GB7 states 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. Footnote 40 confirms that The original building for this purpose is the building that existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.

Policy OL1/2 states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development, unless it is for one of more of the following purposes: agriculture and forestry essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings, provided that this would not result in a disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, or, in the case of replacement existing dwellings, the new dwelling is not materially larger than the one it replaces; limited infilling in existing villages.

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 it's own merits.

The original dwelling (constructed circa 1995) had an approximate volume of 1,094 m³

Extensions undertaken in 2005 increased the volume by 1,364 m³

The approved scheme resulted in a total cumulative increase of 2113m³

The proposed scheme would result in a total cumulative increase of 2599 m³. This is an increase of 486 m³ compared to the previously approved scheme.

The Green Belt Statement submitted with the application, concludes that the proposal would result in additions of over the guideline of 33% volume increase to the original dwelling. A case has therefore been put together by the applicant that reviews the spatial and visual impact of the proposal as well as reviewing wither the proposal would be disproportionate and the fallback position of what could be constructed utilising Permitted Development Rights.

It is accepted, as with the previously approved scheme that the development would be built wholly within the original residential curtilage of the site, and would largely represent infilling and consolidation of the existing property. Whilst the proposal would lead to extensions to the front and rear of the property these would be viewed within the context of the existing property and established ribbon of development along Ainsworth Road. This has been demonstrated by the applicant with the submission of an Aerial photograph that shows the site within the context of Ainsworth Road, Garstang Drive, Cockey Moor Road and Lowercroft Road.

The site boundary is depicted by hedging and walling, and there is significant tall planting along the boundaries of the site that largely screen the site from public views. Whilst distant views of the site are available these views are within the context of the built development set out above.

The permitted development fall back is also a material consideration and the applicant has reviewed what extensions could be implemented at the site demonstrating that two storey extensions could be constructed to the rear of the property, with a large single storey side extension that would significantly increase the footprint of the building.

It was previously considered that this PD fall back would lead to a more sprawling, and more impacting development within the Green Belt than the proposal that was approved. This current proposal however seeks to replace the approved single storey extension with a two storey side extension of the same height as the host dwelling, and nearly double to width of the previously approved single storey side extension in addition to increasing the projection of the rear extension by 700mm. There is no set back present to the front elevation of the proposed side extension leading to a dominating addition. When considered against the modest single storey side extension that was previously approved it is considered that this additional, in design and scale is a visually disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.

The proposal would lead to a volumetric increase of 486m³ when compared with the volumes presented in the initial planning application. This is an increase in volume of 137% over the original property and an 23% increase in volume when compared to the previously approved scheme. In terms of accommodation provided, both the approved and current scheme would have 6no. bedrooms. The proposed scheme however would increase the bedrooms and dressing areas for bedrooms, particularly bedrooms 5 and 6 and would allow for the inclusion of a linen room. For context the proposed enlarged bedroom 5 (excluding the associated dressing room and ensuite) is larger than the National Designated Space Standards (NDSS) overall gross internal floor area for a 1 bed, 1 person, 1 storey, shower room only property. At ground floor the additional floor space would lead to an increase in the size of the sun room, living room 2, kitchen and utility room and the addition of a cinema room.

Whilst the proposed site is an established large residential property, with a large curtilage and located within a ribbon of built development and it is acknowledged that the proposal would not conflict with the surrounding land uses the previously approved scheme was at the maximum extent of what could reasonably be supported when balancing the Policy considerations and fall back positions presented. The extent of the side extension, and cumulative impact of a larger proposed rear extension is considered to be inappropriate development and the the applicant has not demonstrated very special circumstances to address the in principle harm in this instance.

It is considered therefore that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and therefore it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with UDP Policies OL1/2, SPD8 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.

As set out above there is significant screening of the property around the established boundaries of the residential dwelling. The proposed extensions to the front of the property would not project excessively and would consolidate the front elevation giving elements of interest through the introduction of projecting bay windows.

The two storey rear extension would largely be an infill extension to the rear of the property, with gable roofs replicating the shape and style of the original property. The use of stone quoin detailing, and stone surrounds for the windows would replicate the original dwelling. Overall the proposed windows are considered to be suitably aligned, and the use of matching materials is considered to be acceptable.

It is considered that the proposed extensions would not result in over development of the residential amenity space associated with the property, as a large garden would still be retained following the construction of the proposed extensions.

The proposed two storey side extension however is considered to be overly dominant and

unbalances the front elevation interrupting the rhythm created through the introduction of gable extensions. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be the same as the existing dwelling, and as set out above there is no set back is proposed to the original front elevation.

Due to its overall scale, height and width, the proposed two storey extension significantly extends the existing two-storey scale of the property, flush to the main elevation. Contrary to the single storey extension that was previously approved a subordinate relationship to the host dwelling is therefore not maintained. Such a design would not respect the original form, scale and mass of its host, and the two-storey extension appears as a dominant addition to the building, whether in view from the immediate area, or within more distant views.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The property is offset from No. 51 Garstang Drive which would be the nearest residential property, with the proposed rear extension and windows facing towards the electricity substation and side garden of this property rather than the windows of this dwelling.

The nearest first floor bedroom window to the boundary would relate to bedroom 4. This window would be located approximately 8 metres from the shared boundary complying with the 7 metres required by SPD 6. There are no directly facing habitable room windows within 20 metres of the proposed first floor rear habitable room windows.

There are no directly facing properties within 20 metres of the front elevation of the house.

Due to the distances, orientation and intervening boundary treatments it is considered that the proposed extensions would not have an unduly overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties, or result in undue loss of privacy.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6 in residential amenity terms.

Ecology

UDP Policy EN6/3 that seeks to retain, protect and enhance the natural environment and seeks to retain features of ecological or wildlife value.

The proposal would not result in the removal of the entire roof of the existing property as such a bat assessment has not been requested. An informative can be included to ensure that the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s). Natural England should also be informed.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit have confirmed that they have no record of badger or badger setts for this location. As however badger do appear to be somewhere nearby (setts are found in peoples gardens occasionally) a precautionary working measure should be conditioned, for badgers and amphibians, as there is a risk of harm during construction of becoming trapped in any deep excavations.

Access

The access to the site would remain as existing.

Car parking standards within SPD11 for 4 bed and 6 bed properties is the same.

Response to Representations

It is considered that the material planning considerations have been addressed within the main body of the report.

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 Th development by reason of its size, position and design would introduce a discordant, intrusive and permanent development which would have a detrimental and long term harmful impact on the character and openness of the locality and the Green Belt and is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure. The applicant has failed to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances that would outweigh the in principle harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and OL1/2: New Buildings in the Green Belt of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Policy JP-G9: The Green Belt of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Framework, and Policies GB6: Control of development in the Green Belt and GB7: Development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026), Supplementary Planning Document 8: New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt 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>
HP 7/10/2026		DM 8/10/26	