

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 28/08/2025	Ref: 72081/FUL
Registration: 07/07/2025	LDFC: 15/08/2025	Expiry Date: 01/09/2025
Site Visit: 23/07/2025	Site Notice: 23/07/2025	Press Date: 24/07/2025
Objections: 4	Con Area: HOLC	Adv Type: CA
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA Dec Level: DEL Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Variation of condition no. 2 of planning permission 69702 (Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 3 no. detached dwellings): alterations to the design and size of the proposed dwellings to increase internal floor area; balcony at first floor; roof amended and gables increased and changes to fenestration

Location: Unit, 1-2 Halter Inn Works, 11 Redisher Croft, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9SA

Description

The site had previously accommodated an industrial building which operated as a metal components manufacturer. The site is accessed off Bolton Road West via Redisher Croft, (Bridleway 26RAM) and is within Holcombe Conservation Area.

The site itself is fairly level and sits within a dip in Redisher Croft. There are 4 large detached residential properties which are located to the north at a higher level. Directly adjacent to the southern boundary is No 7 Holcombe Road, a residential stone built property. To the east runs a culvert beyond which is the Hare and Hounds public house. The land rises behind the site to the west and a wooded area. There is a blanket Tree Preservation Order (No 65) surrounding the site.

The access to the site is a single lane unadopted road and bridleway which is shared by the site, No 7 and the 4 houses on Redisher Croft.

The site has mainly been cleared of the industrial building in preparation for a development for 3 no 4 bed dwellings which was granted planning permission under application ref 69702.

The approved dwellings are 2 storey with room in the roofspace served by rooflights. Elevations comprise natural stone and slate roof. Internally, accommodation comprises living areas at ground floor, 3 no bedrooms at first floor and a bedroom en-suite in the roofspace.

Two parking spaces would be provided at the front of each property and 1 visitor space next to plot 1.

This application seeks a variation of condition (condition 2) of the approved plans for alterations to the design and size of the proposed dwellings which involve an increase to the internal floor area, balcony at first floor, roof amended and gables increased and changes to the fenestration.

Internal floor area - Extend the ground floor by an additional 3m (extend the front elevation by 1m and extend 2m to the rear by a single storey rear extension)

Balcony - Provided over the ground floor extension with a glazed balustrade and accessed via French doors from a bedroom.

Roof amended and gables increased - Roof gables to be increased and capped with stone copings and roof amended to have a full width gable to the rear (increase in height from the

approved 8.6m to proposed 9.1m).

Changes to the fenestration - Changes to the window design, proportions and materials, omitting the approved traditional style bars and grilles to provide plain glazed upvc openings. Bi-fold patio doors are proposed to the rear ground floor and addition of a central window to the second floor rear elevation to serve a bedroom.

Relevant Planning History

54975 - Proposed demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 3 no detached dwellings. - Approve with Conditions 03/07/2012

54976 - Conservation Area Consent for proposed demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 3 no detached dwellings. - Approve with Conditions 23/05/2012

63892 - Side extension with maximum height of 6.79m to existing workshops and laboratories - Approve with Conditions 11/06/2019

64777 - Siting of 2 no. storage containers - Approve with Conditions 20/12/2019

68618 - Siting of 2 no. storage containers - Approve with Conditions 28/10/2022

69702 - Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 3 no. detached dwellings - Approve with Conditions 22/11/2023

13/0401 - Change of use to residential - 01/09/2013

19/0179 - Siting of 2 no. shipping containers - 09/10/2019

22/0119 - Breach of conditions of planning approval 64777 - 10/05/2022

Publicity

Letters sent to 24 properties on 14/7/25.

Site notice posted 23/7/25

Press advert 24/7/25.

Four objections received with the following comments -

- The impact from the proposed increased depth/area of the side gable elevation to the front, and back, of the buildings significantly affects the outlook, and light, from the front elevation of my house.
- The increase in depth of the building to the front elevation reduces parking space, and will only add to risk of obstructing the bridleway, in front of the houses, and access to Redisher Croft.
- The impact from the proposed roof modifications at the rear of the buildings significantly affects the outlook, and light, from the front elevation of my house,
- The new proposed windows on the rear of the 2nd floor of the properties directly overlook the existing properties on Redisher Croft, the previously proposed roof lights did not.
- The proposed balconies on the 1st floor, will directly overlook the front bedrooms of my house, and other residents' houses on Redisher Croft.
- The revised drawings detail an approximately 30% larger footprint of the buildings on an already congested site.
- There are no height dimensions on the revised drawings, can it be confirmed that the overall height will be no higher than the previously approved application? Due to the proposed additional depth of the buildings, I suspect the height of the building height may have increased
- There is a side window on the 1st floor that looks directly at the front bedrooms of my house.
- As residents of Redisher Croft our concern with the planning local to our home is that we are protected in the enjoyment of our property. With outdoor balconies comes sound and we are concerned that the raised nature of the balconies will mean that we can hear the residents more than if they were inside.
- Roof lights are modern and in keeping with the build.
- The revised drawings detail an approximately 30% larger footprint of the buildings on an already congested site. This is too much. We are already very concerned on

- parking, this is a little known private road.
- Redisher Croft is a private road. We object to windows facing this.
- Can you please clarify whether Planning Application 72801 reduces the parking facilities at the front of the buildings ?
- Supplementary Planning Document 11: Parking Standards in Bury (SPD11) has now been adopted with effect from 11 June 2025 and replaces the previous 2007 guidance. The parking standards for general residential developments have now increased to 3 spaces per four bed dwelling, making the parking provisions for this development below standard before construction has started. Can you please ensure that Planning Application 72801 does not in any way permit encroachment into the parking spaces.
- As a result of my concerns above and below, I also strongly object to this variation in design, due to the significant impacts it will have on parking arrangements for the buildings, my outlook, light, and privacy, and those of the other residents of Redisher Croft.
- I note on the application the question asks "can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land" which has been answered "no". Given the fact there is a public bridleway just 10 yards from the front of the properties I would suggest this has been answered incorrectly.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer - Objects and recommends refusal

Highways - Recommend refusal - Objects and recommends refusal.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
EC2/2	Employment Land and Premises
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
EN8/1	Tree Preservation Orders
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN6/4	Wildlife Links and Corridors
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

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 PpE 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

The principle of a residential development for 3 no dwellings has previously been established following the grant of planning consent 69702.

The considerations of this variation of condition application relate to issues of layout, scale, design and appearance.

Layout

In terms of the layout, the proposed development would continue to provide a row of 3 detached 4 bed dwellings with gardens and bin stores at the rear and driveways to the front.

The application proposes to increase the footprint of the dwellings by adding 3m to the

length of each of the dwellings by extending the dwellings 1m further forward and 2m at the rear to provide a single storey rear extension from the previously approved 10.15m to 13.15m).

This would result in changes to the size of the rear garden and front driveways.

At the rear, garden layouts would be reduced in size by 2m but there would still be adequate amenity area of circa 8.5m to 9m long to serve each dwelling.

As it is proposed to extend the dwellings forward by 1m each of the driveways would be reduced in length by 1m.

This would result in the driveway to the southern most plot reduced to 4.8m in length which would be sub-standard when assessed against SPD11.

The driveways to the other two dwellings would just meet the criteria to provide a 5m length driveway. However, the proposed site plan is basic in detail and does not provide any detail of boundary walls, pathways or shrubbery/grass, so it is not clear if the development would be adequate in providing acceptable driveway widths to facilitate 2 cars.

It is therefore considered that the proposal to increase the floor area of the dwellings would result in sub-standard driveway lengths and inadequate parking provision and without further detailed and topographical based plans, the application contains insufficient information to properly assess the impact of the development and its access and parking arrangements on the Public Right of Way.

The Highway Authority have been consulted on the application and recommend refusal on lack of information to enable informed conclusions of the development to be reached. the proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2, HT2/4 and JP-C8.

Scale, design and appearance

The application site is within Holcombe Village 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.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment at para 207 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.

At para 212, 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.

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. and policies and decisions should ensure developments establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Paragraph 41 of the National Design Guide states that development should understand and relate well to the site, its local and wider context. Well-designed new development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary, enhancing positive qualities and improving negative ones.

Paragraph 48 of the National Design Guide states that well designed places and buildings are influenced positively by the history and heritage of the site, its surroundings and wider area, including cultural influences.

Holcombe's typical development reflects that of an upland collection of modest sized dwellings. Footprints generally are small and elevations typically stone with conservative window openings, simple elevations and slate roofs.

The previously approved scheme proposed a row of cottage type dwellings of a traditional character and appearance reflective of cottage/terrace type dwellings typical to the historic character of the area. The development represented the simple vernacular form and materials of the dwellings that contribute to the character and appearance of the Holcombe conservation area and were considered to be of an appropriate scale and massing within the setting of the site and context of this historic area. For that application, it was concluded the scheme would preserve the special character of the Conservation Area.

This application proposes significant changes to the scale and design of the houses, most if not all, considered to strip away the important references and features which were integrated in the previous scheme and characteristic of the Holcombe Conservation Area.

Firstly, the proposed increase to the height of the gables and change to the roof pitch would create a 'top heavy' and disproportionate roof form which would appear out of scale, discordant and alien within the setting and character of the Holcombe Conservation Area and the immediate area. Although streetscene and section plans have not been produced, the increase to the roof and resulting disproportionate elevations and facade would be jarring within this small hamlet of the conservation area.

The change to the design and introduction of plain glazed contemporary upvc windows and door openings would be unrelated to the immediately adjacent surrounding development and the introduction of a balcony of this type would introduce an urbanising and alien feature.

In terms of the design and appearance, the proposed scheme would significantly alter the character of the original scheme, to an almost unrecognisable and unrelated development. Furthermore, the increase to the floor space would alter the driveway lengths and potential parking provision, which would conflict with condition 14 of the original consent to provide the approved parking and access.

A Heritage Statement has not been submitted with the application and by not doing so, fails to provide any reasoned assessment of the proposed development in relation to the significance of the heritage asset.

The proposal represents a missed opportunity to further enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

As such the variation of condition to the approved plans cannot be supported and would be contrary to paragraph 219 of the NPPF and section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and planning policies H2/1, H2/2, EN2/1, EN2/2, HT2/4 and JP-P2.

Impact on residential amenity

Some of the objections refer to the impacts on privacy of those living on Redisher Croft to the north of the site.

The balcony would be located on the rear of the property and set at a 90 degree angle to the houses on Redisher Croft and therefore at an oblique angle. These houses are also set at a higher level and would be more than 13m away from the nearest plot. The window on the side elevation would be to bathroom, which would be small in size and obscure glazed.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the privacy of the adjacent occupiers.

In terms of the scale of development and change to the roof form and height, whilst no section plans have been produced, the proposed development would be set at a lower level and given the intervening road and separation distances it is considered there would not be an overbearing impact to those living on Redisher Croft.

In terms of potential noise from the balcony given its position on the houses and distance and relationship to the adjacent houses, it is considered that impacts from noise would not be significantly harmful to residents and no more than noise which could be created from use of the garden spaces.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not be detrimentally harmful to existing residents.

Response to objections

Issues of design, privacy and scale of development and parking have been covered in the above report.

The development seeks a variation of condition to the original approval and in terms of parking provision, as there would be no increase in the number of bedrooms proposed, there would be no requirement to assess the development against the revised SPD11.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development by virtue of the increase in height, change to the roof form, alterations to the facades and design and placement of the windows would introduce discordant, alien and urbanising features and design which would have an unacceptable impact on the Holcombe Conservation Area of which the site forms part. The proposal would neither preserve or enhance the traditional character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflict with the following policies EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 Conservation Area Control, JP-P2 Heritage and the principles of the NPPF.
- 2 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient, topographical survey-based and dimensioned information in order to properly assess the impact of the proposed development and its access and parking arrangements on the adjacent Public Right of Way (Bridleway) No. 26, Ramsbottom (Redisher Croft). The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/1, HT2/4, JP-C5 and JP-C8.
- 3 The proposed development, by virtue of the sub-standard driveway lengths and failure to provide adequate facilities for the parking of cars associated with the development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity and safety of future occupiers and safety of existing occupiers and users of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies H2/1, H2/2, JP-H3, HT2/4 and SPD11.

DELEGATED REPORT

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT 28/8/25			