

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 05/06/2025

Ref:71818/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 16/04/2025

LDfC: 08/05/2025

Expiry Date: 11/06/2025

Site Visit: 16/05/2025

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; Front porch

Location: 182 St Anns Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9QS

Description

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached house located on St Anns Road at the junction with Masfield Avenue, to the south. At the front there is a low brick wall with railings to the front and side boundaries. The front of the site is completely paved and there is a single parking space to the front of the existing side garage extension. There is a fence along the side and rear boundaries. At the rear of the property there is a single storey extension, a small patio area, decking and the remainder of the garden is grass and planting.

The proposal is to build a two storey side extension as well as front porch. The extension would project around 3.95m to the side and would be set back from the front elevation by around 450mm. It would measure 8.47m long and at first floor level the extension would be set back from the original front elevation by around 1.37m. Across the rear it would measure 6.86m and it would project just under 3m from the original rear elevation. The roof would be hipped and at the rear there would be bay windows to the ground and first floor levels.

The porch would measure 1.61m x 2.59m and the roof would be pitched.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

6 neighbours notified on 17/04/2025 - 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.

SPD 6 states that where extensions are located adjacent to a boundary with a highway they should be at least 2m away from the boundary. However, a lesser set back may be

acceptable in some locations. In this instance the dwelling is angled away from the southern boundary so the front of the extension would be closer to the boundary than it would at the rear.

The proposed development would be built with a design and finished materials that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building as well as with neighbouring properties.

At the front the single storey section would be around 1m away from the side boundary. The first floor would be set back from the front elevation and would be around 1.4m away from the side boundary towards the front. However, the building is angled away from the boundary so the majority of the extension would be over 2m away from the boundary. With this in mind it is considered that the extension would be acceptable in the position shown and it would not cause any significant harm in terms of the character of the existing streetscene.

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 -

- The separation distance to properties to the front and south side of the site would be more than sufficient in terms of SPD 6.
- The extension would be set well back from the adjacent junction with Masefield Avenue to the south, so there would not be any significant detrimental impact in terms of vehicles using the junction.
- There would be over 8.5m to the rear boundary, which would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- There are no habitable room windows to the side elevation of no.2 Masefield Avenue at the rear of site.
- As the extension would be to the south side of the existing property there would be no significant detrimental effect on residential amenity at no.180 St Anns Road, to the north side.
- The distance from the front of the extension to the front boundary would be acceptable given any views from the new bedroom window would overlook the highway in front.
- The front porch would not interfere with the parking arrangements within 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 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 maximum of 3 parking spaces. The site as existing has an area at the front for parking a vehicle and this would remain following the side extension being built. There are no restrictions to on street parking to the front and side of the site. As such, 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 Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were

DELEGATED REPORT

incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. 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 drawing numbered PL03 received on 01/04/2025 and drawings numbered PL02B, PL04A and PL05 received on 03/06/2025 as modified by the email from JVN Design Ltd dated 03/06/2025. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details 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 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>
AU - 05/06/2025			