

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 07/05/2026	Ref: 72977/FUL
Registration: 31/03/2026	LDfC: 26/04/2026	Expiry Date: 26/05/2026
Site Visit: 15/04/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey/single storey rear extension; Garage conversion with first floor side extension; Front porch

Location: 429 Bury And Bolton Road, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 4LJ

Description

The property is a two storey bay fronted detached house. It has garden to the front and a large area hard surfaced for parking. To the side is an attached garage which runs into a utility and to the rear is a conservatory and garden at a raised level. Beyond the rear boundary is open land. The neighbouring property to the west side is No.427 and is extended single storey at the rear to the site boundary side. To the opposite side No.431 is extended single storey at the side and to the rear has two projecting bays. There is a patio from the back of the house and the lawn steps up at a raised level. The site and surrounding area is within the Green Belt.

The application includes the conversion of the garage to a study and wc and with a first floor extension constructed above. To the rear a single storey would come out 3.3m deep from the converted garage and run across for 5m where it would increase to two storey for 4.9m across. The extensions would form an extended kitchen with dining and lounge area. At first floor an additional and extended bedroom. To the front a porch would come out 1.44m for 2.6m across.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Surrounding neighbours were notified by letter and one response has been received from a nearby neighbour the concerns in summary are :-

- Loss of natural light and sunlight
- Detrimental impact to a greenbelt area
- Already been too many extensions just to make money and then move away.
- If a three bedroom detached house is not big enough for a small family is it okay to let them extend just for the sake of having a larger property to make other peoples lives a misery.

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

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
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.

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. In addition to this UDP Policy OL1/2 and SPD 8 state that extensions of existing dwellings should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. In general an extension to be up to a third of the volume of the original dwelling may be acceptable however, each proposal will be considered on its own merits.

Green Belt - The planning statement accompanying the application states the volume increase to be 44% which would then exceed the advice given within SPD 8 and therefore has the potential to have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The volume itself would not be determinative, it is how the increase would 'read' in terms of openness and whether the proposals would appear subordinate to the main existing dwelling.

The statement notes that the rear extension will have no detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and does not consider the cumulative increase disproportionate to the original dwelling.

The first floor side extension would have a roof line below the main ridge. To the rear the single and two storey would be seen in connection with the main house within the domestic curtilage. Whilst the property is located within the Green Belt it is along a main road which has residential properties fronting. As such, for the reasons as noted above, it is not considered that the proposal would impact on the character or openness of the Green Belt.

Visual amenity and design - There would be a 1.5m gap to the side boundary following the first floor side extension and therefore terracing would not be an issue. It would have a hipped roof set below the main ridge and be set back 0.48m back from the existing front elevation. To the rear the two storey would have a hipped roof and a flat roof to the single storey. The front porch would have a dual pitched roof and at 1.4m deep would not project excessively. Materials would be to match the existing house.

The proposal is considered acceptable and in keeping with the existing property and would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Parking - The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4 and SPD6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered. This can then require the proposal to provide a 3 parking spaces. The front garden has a large hard surfaced area and can accommodate this level of parking.

Residential amenity - The proposed first floor would be to the side to No.427 where it would be set 1.5m in from the boundary and would project less than 1m beyond its front and rear elevations. The proposed single storey rear would project less than 3m from the rear of the single storey to 427. The existing side elevation of the site at ground floor would have a kitchen door and wc window added. The side elevation to No.427 runs as two storey blank wall.

To the opposite side to No.431 the proposed two storey would not encroach a 45 degree line from the closest ground floor main window. In terms of the outside area then the garden to 431 then it has a patio area across the width rear of the house with the main access out to the party wall side. The rear garden steps up in levels and is fairly lengthy. With the gardens north facing the proposal would not cause any significant overshadowing for any lengthy period that would give grounds for refusal.

The plans note a first floor window added to the existing side elevation of the site to this side to 431. It would be to an ensuite and is noted to be obscure glazed and therefore this would not cause any overlooking and would be permitted development. A condition is added to see it is maintained as obscure.

There would then be no serious impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbouring properties.

DELEGATED REPORT

The proposal complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Response to objection - The issues regarding Green Belt and the impact on the relevant neighbouring properties are addressed in the above report.

Why a homeowner would choose to extend their property is not a matter for the assessment of the application.

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 Sheet 1, Sheet 2, Sheet 3, Sheet 4, Existing and Proposed Site Plan 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 and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.
- 3 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the ensuite window to the east side elevation shall, as noted on plan Sheet 4, be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
Reason. To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers and to accord with 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>
JL	7/5/26	DM	7/5/26