

**DELEGATED REPORT****Report by** Amanda**Date of report:** 10/06/2025**Ref:**71427/FUL

Uhunmwagho

**Registration:** 22/04/2025**LDFC:** 18/05/2025**Expiry Date:** 17/06/2025**Site Visit:** 03/06/2025**Site Notice:** N/A**Press Date:** 01/05/2025**Objections:** 0**Con Area:** AINS**Adv Type:** CA**Reason for Delay:****EIA:** NA

N/A

**Dec Level:** DEL**Stat Class:** HOUS**Proposal:** Raised decking at rear with storage underneath**Location:** 10 Camden Close, Ainsworth, Bolton, BL2 5RH**Description**

The application relates to a two storey detached house located on a cul-de-sac in Ainsworth. The area to the rear of the site is Ainsworth Conservation area and the conservation area cuts across the rear corner of the site. The whole of Ainsworth village is also within the designated Green Belt.

At the rear of the property there is a garden area with fences to all boundaries. The garden area is made up of half astro turf and half deck. The raised decking has been erected at the end of the garden, up to the rear boundary. It projects around 2.37m out from the same level as the original garden area and it measures 7.52m wide. As the land level drops at the rear of the garden the decking is around 1.8m high at the rear. The walls are finished with composite cladding and there is storage below the decking accessed via a door on the south east side elevation. The balustrade is glazed with steel posts and handrail. The height of the balustrade is 1.1m.

The rear boundary has been built up with a 1.5m high timber fence on top of concrete panels. The total height of the rear boundary concrete panels and fence is 2.4m. There are steps and gate to the south east side of the decking, leading out to the open land to the rear of the site.

**Relevant Planning History**

24/0199 - Installation of raised decking area - 06/12/2024

**Publicity**

Two neighbours notified on 23/04/2025 - No comments or objections received.

Site notice erected on 24/04/2025.

Press notice on 01/05/2025.

**Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations**

Conservation Officer - No objections.

**Pre-start Conditions** - Not relevant.**Development Plan and Policies**

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations &amp; Extensions

SPD8 DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas

EN2/2 Conservation Area Control

NPPF      National Planning Policy Framework  
PFE      Places for Everyone

## **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 of the proposal on the surrounding Green Belt and conservation area.

**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 149 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.

Ainsworth village is within the designated Green Belt but it is a heavily populated area sub-suburban setting with many different types of properties. The site is located within a row of other similar properties, some of which have decking.

The Green Belt Statement submitted with the application, concludes that the proposal would result in additions less than a third of the original volume of the building. It would also be similar to development at neighbouring dwellings and it would not extend beyond the residential curtilage. As such it would not have any significant detrimental effect on the character or openness of the surrounding Green Belt.

**Impact on Conservation Area and Visual Amenity -**

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.

Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that 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 216 of the NPPF states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

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.

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 majority of the site is not located within the conservation area, but the Ainsworth Village conservation area does cut across the rear corner of the site. The conservation officer was consulted and they have no objection to the proposal. The decking has been built wholly within the residential curtilage.

The decking is to the rear of the site, but it backs on to an open field which is used by the public. As such the decking is fully visible from the footpath and field at the rear of the site. The boundary fence has been built up at the rear measuring 2.4m high. The decking area sits above the fence line.

Including the site there are two properties on Camden Close which have higher level decking directly adjacent to the rear boundary. There are 5 other properties which back on to the field and all the gardens are raised in comparison. However the ground level to those properties drops along the rear boundary with the higher level set back.

The timber fence would be similar in appearance to a neighbouring property along the row and as the decking has a clear glazed balustrade its additional height would not appear overly intrusive in terms of visual amenity. Some of the neighbouring properties also have raised decking to the rear gardens. The design of the proposal is considered acceptable in this location.

Given the above the proposal would not have any significant detrimental effect on the existing streetscene or character of the surrounding area and it would preserve the character of the conservation area. As such 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 -**

- Directly to the rear of the site is an open field. There are no residential properties to the rear of the site.
- The main part of the rear garden at no.11 next door is at the same height as the site and the rear most section of the garden is lower compared to site. However, there are two shed in this area so even if users of the decking could view over this area it would not be over useable spaces within the garden.
- It is also noted that there are steps separating the decking and the boundary with no.11.
- On the opposite side the decking is adjacent to an embankment with planting. This appears to be outside of the boundary belonging to no.9 to the north of the site.
- Part of the garden at no.9 would be visible from the decking, but this area is also visible from the original garden area on site. The main garden area to the rear of no.9 is set well away from the shared boundary with the site. As such it is considered that the decking would not cause any significant detrimental harm in terms of residential amenity at this property.

Taking the above into account 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.

**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 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 24\_11.01.GA\_01, 24\_11.01.GA\_02 and 24\_11.01.GA\_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 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

## **DELEGATED REPORT**

Everyone Joint Development Plan listed

- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall be a mixture of closed board timber fence panels to the boundary as well as composite panels and decking. The balustrade to the decking shall be glazed with a brushed steel handrail.

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 - 10/06/2025     |             |                         |             |