

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Steven Gunn
Russell

Date of report: 12/04/2022

Ref:68061/FUL

Registration: 09/02/2022

LDfC: 10/03/2022

Expiry Date: 06/04/2022

Site Visit: 31/03/2022

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: NONE

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey extension at side; Front porch; Canopy to front to extend across either side of porch

Location: 37 Bull Hill Crescent, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1BR

Description

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached house on a residential street of similar properties. Within the rear garden there are two existing sheds and a raised patio overlooking the garden. Both neighbours properties are as originally built. Existing property walls have white rendering at lower half, and pebbledash for the top half. At the front there is a driveway providing off-street parking.

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey extension would be sited within the existing front and rear building lines and project out up to 1.5m less than the shared boundary and have a hipped roof carried over from the existing roof. Parking provision would remain unchanged. Materials would match existing but finished in a white render to match the house and accommodate a study plus store at ground floor and an additional bedroom at first floor.

There would be a separation of 13m to the rear boundary beyond which is an unidentified/disused area of community space including extensive trees and shrub planting.

Relevant Planning History

None

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 17/02/2022 sent to 10 neighbours. No representations were received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury

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) and 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 Policy 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.

Visual amenity - UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to achieve a high standard of design that compliments the original building, does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of neighbouring properties, and protects the general street scene.

In terms of design and appearance the extension is generally in-keeping with the existing house. Situated at the side and rear, the extension would be readily visible from the public arena, although its siting, scale, and design is considered to be appropriate for this property and streetscene. Materials would match existing including white rendering.

Given the type of property and alignment of this street SPD6 normally requires the first floor side extension to be set back 1.5m to avoid creating a terracing effect, however as this property is at the end of the street it is considered that this requirement can be relaxed. In this respect the extension complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Residential amenity - UDP policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

In terms of overlooking and privacy to the rear, the 13m separation distance to the rear boundary from the extension is considered to be acceptable and complies with adopted guidance in SPD6. The existing tree and shrub planting along the rear boundary would further reduce the impact on the residents to the rear.

The extension is acceptable in relation to the attached neighbour as it complies with the '45-degree rule' within SPD6. In terms of the unattached neighbour at No.39, there is a side habitable window that is largely south facing, in front of which a large caravan is currently parked and hence does not appear to be in everyday use. Calculations show that the proposed extension would slightly block the '45-degree rule' alignment as measured from this window by about 1.4m. However, given the circumstances and that current council guidance in SPD6 gives less weight to side windows it is therefore considered that this side window also cannot be given a great deal of weight.

In terms of the general prominence and impact on daylight the extension is set off the shared side boundary and is to the west of No.39. The extension would have an impact on part of the neighbours rear garden in the afternoons, however any overshadowing would not be seriously excessive above and beyond the existing situation as would be expected for a side two storey extension. In this respect the extension would not have such a serious impact on the outlook from No.39 to warrant refusal.

The extension would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Highways – No changes proposed.

Conclusion – In consideration of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of the design, and siting, of this development. As such, the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

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 4, 5, 6, and 7 as provided on 09/02/2022 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 Unitary 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>
SGR	12/04/2022		