

Planning Statement and Green Belt Justification

Adaptations to and construction of a rear extension above existing games room at
Redbank House, Elbut Lane, Heywood

on behalf of :

Ms Makin

Feb 2024

Contents

1. Introduction	
2. The application proposal	
3. National and local planning policy	
4. The Applicants' case and Green Belt Justification	
5. Summary and conclusion	

1. Introduction

1.1 This Planning and Green Belt Justification Statement has been produced to support an application for planning permission for the construction of a rear extension above existing games room ("the Application Proposals") for Ms Makin ("the Applicant") who lives at 40 Cockey Moor Road, Bury

1.2 This Statement has been prepared by Zach Thorp of Thorp Design Services.

1.3 This Statement has been prepared pursuant to s.62 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and Article 4C of the General Development Procedure Order 1995 (as amended), as informed by Circular 01/2006 and CABE Guidance issued in 2006.

2. The Application Proposal

2.1 The Application Proposals are Shown in more detail on the drawings.; they include construction of a ground floor rear extension to compromise of additional living space.

2.2 The size of the original property is 462.6m²

2.3 The size of the existing extensions are 117.7m²

2.4 The size to be removed in proposal is 6m²

2.5 The proposal is 54.5m².

3. National, regional and local planning policy National Planning Policy

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework . chapter 13 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) provision for appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport and recreation;
- c) extension or alteration of a building providing it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) replacement of a building, providing 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 community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exceptions 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.

4. The Applicant's case and Green Belt Justification

4.1 The Application Proposals included existing extensions increase the % size of to 35% larger than the original property size.

4.2 The property sits away from major residential developments and has a large plot of land (3418.3m²) .

4.3 The extension will be above an existing extension and as such will not be a detriment to the greenbelt in terms of land space lost as such an extension on top of the existing building in my professional opinion would be satisfactory.

4.4 The extension works will be constructed out of matching materials to the existing, giving the appearance that it has always been part of the development and the local area.

Thorp Design Services
thorpdesignservices@gmail.com

5. Summary and Conclusion

5.1 The Application Proposals respect relevant national and local planning policies. In terms of design, they reflect the very best, and it causes no harm.

5.2 Planning permission should therefore be granted, subject to appropriate conditions.