

DELEGATED REPORT**Report by** Amanda**Date of report:** 26/06/2025**Ref:**71899/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 01/05/2025**LDfC:** 10/06/2025**Expiry Date:** 26/06/2025**Site Visit:** 24/06/2025**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 side/rear extension; First floor front extension; Render to all elevations**Location:** 21 Windsor Crescent, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0DD**Description**

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached house with a small front garden with a wall and hedge along the front boundary. There is an existing driveway to the front/side of the site with a detached outbuilding at the rear. The rear garden is fenced off from the driveway in front with a pedestrian access gate. At the rear of the property there is a garden with fencing to all boundaries. There are conifers along the rear boundary belonging to the neighbour at no.4 Cobb Close to the rear.

The proposal is to build a two storey side/rear extension, first floor front extension and render to all elevations. At the side the extension would be set back from the existing front elevation by around 1.74m. It would measure 3.4m wide x 10m long and the roof would be hipped. At the rear it would project 3.49m x 8.7m wide with a hipped roof. According to the proposed drawings all of the elevations would be rendered white.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

4 neighbours notified on 19/05/2025 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

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

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

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.

Visual Amenity -

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 design of the extended property would be similar to other properties along Windsor Crescent and as there are other properties along the road which are rendered this would not appear out of character in this area. The design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location.

Given the above 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 -

- Properties to the front of the site would be an acceptable distance from the extension not to have any significant detrimental impact on residential amenity at those properties.
- The rear boundary abuts the rear garden of no.4 Cobb Close. That property is located around 25m away from the shared boundary and they have trees lining the boundary which would screen most views of the extension from their property and garden.
- No.23 Windsor Crescent, (attached), has a conservatory directly adjacent to the shared boundary and the extension would project around 769mm past the rear elevation of that. This would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- With regards to the upper floor the extension would project 3.4m from the original rear elevation and it would be around 100mm off the shared boundary with no.23. There is a bedroom window closest to the shared boundary with site and SPD 6 states that a projection of upto 3m would be acceptable. Taking the projection of the extension and the gap to the shared boundary the projection of the extension would be around 300mm more than normally expected in this situation. However, the site is due north of the attached neighbour. As such even though the extension would project slightly more than what would be ideal, its impact on residential amenity at no.23 would not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the proposal.
- As the application property is built at an angle to no.19 there it is considered that the proposed two storey side/rear extension would not have any significant detrimental impact on residential amenity at this property, or the path of sunlight during the day.
- The application property is angled away from the shared boundary with no.19 to the north of site and there would be no habitable room windows facing this site. There is also an existing garage at no.19 which would screen any views to and from the proposed ground floor windows in the side elevation of the extension.
- The drive length to the front of the extension would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- The plans show that all of the development would be built within the curtilage of the site.

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 in terms of separation distance to the surrounding properties.

Parking -

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 5 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 maximum of 3 parking spaces. The site as existing has a drive to the front/side providing on site parking for at least two vehicles. Once the side extension it built this could be reduced to one space but the applicant would have the ability to create a second space at the front of the site if required. The area has on street parking. In this instance then the parking arrangements are considered sufficient.

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:

DELEGATED REPORT

- 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 001, 002 and 003 Rev 4 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 Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.
- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall be render to all elevations as shown on the approved drawings.
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 - 26/06/2025			