

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 03/09/2025	Ref: 72191/FUL
Registration: 17/07/2025	LDfC: 01/09/2025	Expiry Date: 11/09/2025
Site Visit: 27/08/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	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/side extensions

Location: 24 Brookfield, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1EL

Description

The application relates to a two storey detached house at the end of a residential cul-de-sac characterised by red brick terraced properties. The immediate neighbour to the south (No.22) is a two storey semi-detached house that has been extended to the rear. To the north is a treed embankment up to the metrolink line.

The proposal involves a part single/part two storey extension on the north side, the two storey section of which wraps around part of the rear. A single storey extension would project out 4m and run 3.3m across the remainder of the rear elevation. The rear extension would be about 1m beyond the neighbour's rear elevation. The new roofs would be hipped and run over onto the existing roof. The side extension would accommodate a single garage at ground floor with space for parking in front. The ground floor would allow for a larger kitchen and there would be two additional bedrooms upstairs.

The extensions would be finished in brick and tile to match the house.

Relevant Planning History

67953 - Demolition of existing link detached dwelling and erection of 2 no. semi-detached dwellings - Approve with Conditions 14/12/2022

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 11/08/2025. No objections received

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions - N/A

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design

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 PpE 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.

Visual amenity - In terms of scale, design and appearance, the proposed extensions are in keeping with the existing house and would not appear incongruous within the streetscape, particularly as the site is not prominent at the end of the cul-de-sac, adjacent to the metrolink embankment. The roof would be hipped and carry over onto the main roof and the material to match, are acceptable. The proposal complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 Alterations and Extensions relating to visual amenity.

Residential amenity - The side extension is adjacent to the existing metrolink embankment on the north side and would have little impact on residential amenity. The rear extension is more prominent on the rear and would be viewed from the rear garden of the immediate neighbour at No.22 Brookfield. However the impact is mitigated to a significant degree by setting the two storey element away from the shared side boundary and the same neighbour having a rear extension to set the building further back from the applicant's property (see photo) . A single storey element would be adjacent to the boundary and just

less than 1m further out from the neighbour's rear elevation and this complies with the '45 degree rule' and is considered to be acceptable. It is noted that there are no objection from neighbours.

In terms of residential amenity, the proposal is acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 Alterations and Extensions.

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 00-001, 002, 003, 004, 02-001 and 02-002 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 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 EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
T.Beirne	03/09/2025	DM -	04/03/2025