

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 05/01/2026	Ref: 72386/FUL
Registration: 27/11/2025	LDfC: 19/12/2025	Expiry Date: 22/01/2026
Site Visit: 23/12/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIOT

Proposal: Extension to roof at sides / Loft conversions with front and rear dormer extensions; new front porches (66/66A/68 Albert Avenue) and single storey extension at rear with decking, handrail and steps to rear garden (68 Albert Avenue).

Location: 66, 66A & 68 Albert Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0LX

Description

The application relates to a pair of two storey semi-detached properties on a residential road of similar styled houses. Whilst No.68 is a single dwelling, No.66 has been converted into two flats. Hipped roof and bay windows on the front. Parking is on-street.

The proposal involves raising the roof by approximately 300mm and creating gables on either side. Each property would have two small pitched roof dormers on the front with a box dormer across the rear roof plane.

Each property would have a new brick built front porch with pitched roof. No.68 would have a single storey extension projecting out 7.4m from the rear elevation and running across the width of the rear elevation (6.8m). There would be a small area of decking from the patio doors with steps to rear garden.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 28/11/2025. 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

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.

Visual amenity - The roof would be raised slightly and the formation of gables from the existing hipped roof would not be so prominent within the streetscape. The front dormers across the front elevations are modest in scale and sit comfortably on the roofplane. The box dormer on the rear would not be prominent or viewed from the public arena.

The front porches are modest in scale and in keeping with the appearance of the frontage.

The single storey rear extension on No.68 is large but the impact is mitigated somewhat by the extension on the rear of the neighbour at No.70.

The proposal, in terms of visual amenity, is acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 relating to alterations and extensions.

Residential amenity - The new porches are modest in scale and do not present any residential amenity issues. With an existing single storey extension on the rear of No.70

DELEGATED REPORT

Albert Avenue, there are no serious residential amenity issues arising from the proposed rear extension at No.68. There are no serious overlooking issues from the roof alterations and dormer extensions. The new decking area is small and would not create any serious overlooking of neighbours. It is noted that there are no objections from neighbours.

Given the relationship with the neighbours, there are no residential amenity issues arising from the proposal in relation to UDP Policies H2/3 and guidance within 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 001, 002, 003/4, 004/3 and 005/3 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 H2/3 Extensions and alterations.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
Tom Beirne	05/01/2026	DM	13/06/26