

DELEGATED REPORT**Report by** Amanda**Date of report:** 27/02/2026**Ref:**72348/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 17/11/2025**LDFC:** 09/12/2025**Expiry Date:** 12/01/2026**Site Visit:** 26/11/2025**Site Notice:** N/A**Press Date:** N/A**Objections:** 2**Con Area:** N/A**Adv Type:** NONE**Reason for Delay:****EIA:** NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL**Stat Class:** HOUS**Proposal:** Two storey side extension; Front porch**Location:** 15 Penrhyn Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1LW**Description**

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached house with a small garden and drive to the front of the site and a private garden to the rear. The house has curved bay windows to the front elevation and square bay windows to the rear. There was a garage to the side elevation previously but this has since been removed in order to build the extension and to the rear there is a detached outbuilding which the applicant advised is a temporary structure to store building goods in relation to the extension.

The application has been submitted following a complaint to planning enforcement advising that the applicant was building a two storey side extension without permission. Building works have currently ceased pending the outcome of this planning application.

The side extension has been built flush with the original front and rear elevations at ground floor level, with a short first floor set back from the original front elevation of just 600mm and at the rear the wall has been set in 900mm. Following discussion with the applicant on site they submitted revised drawings showing that the rear elevation would be moved back so it would be flush with the original rear elevation. This would result in the set back to the front being 1.5m.

The extension would provide an extension to the existing kitchen and also a store at ground floor level with an additional bedroom above. The roof would be hipped over the two storey aspect of the extension and the roof over the front at ground floor level would be mono-pitched.

A porch has been built to the front of the original dwelling. After speaking with the applicant they submitted a revised drawing showing that the front porch would be reduced in size to 2.5m wide with a projection of 1.2m forward of the existing front elevation. The roof would be mono-pitched to reflect the single storey roof to the side extension.

The applicant has used red brick in the construction of the extension and porch. They are proposing to rebuild the front porch and the front elevation of the side extension in a darker coloured brick (Anglian red multi rustic) which would be more in keeping with the bricks on the existing front elevation of the dwelling. The red brick finish to the side and rear elevations of the two storey side extension would remain.

Relevant Planning History

25/0320 - Two storey side extension and front porch - 18/11/2025

Publicity

6 neighbours notified on 19/11/2025 - Two objections received.

- The proposed two-storey side extension would not be in keeping with the established character and ambience of the street.
- It's scale and massing would disrupt the uniform appearance of Penrhyn Drive and could set an undesirable precedent for future extensions.
- Additionally, the proposed front porch is disproportionately large when compared with existing porches on neighbouring properties, making it appear out of character with the surrounding streetscape.
- We have concerns with the side extension at 15 Penrhyn drive. Firstly the bricks used are not in keeping the main house. We believe they may be a balcony and window at the back which will directly over look our garden and back living room invading our privacy. With it being a two story extension we feel it is very imposing on our property blocking out sunlight. The brick work on the lower part of the extension at the side of our property is not pointed correctly and 2 types have bricks have been used.
- We are not opposed to the porch or single storey extension.

Following receipt of revised drawings received showing a 1.5m first-floor set back at the front emailed to neighbours on 18/12/2025 - One objection received and one question.

- The proposed development would not be in the best interests of the character or ambience of Penrhyn Drive. The scale, massing, and overall form of the two-storey side extension would appear dominant and out of keeping with the established pattern of development along the street. The proposal would disrupt the uniform appearance of the area and erode the cohesive streetscape that currently defines Penrhyn Drive.
- Furthermore, approval of this development could set an undesirable precedent for similar large-scale extensions in the future, which would cumulatively harm the character of the street and undermine the visual balance of the surrounding properties.
- In addition, the proposed front porch is excessively large when compared with the existing porches on neighbouring properties. Its size and prominence would be inconsistent with the prevailing design approach in the street, further detracting from the visual harmony of the area.
- For these reasons, the proposal fails to respect the established character of the street and would result in a detrimental impact on the local environment. I respectfully request that the planning authority refuse this application.

One other neighbour replied asking if the revised drawings meant that the existing building would be taken down and rebuilt, and they also sent in photos of the brick work on the extension which is currently half built.

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 1.5m set back to the first floor at the front of the extension would ensure that terracing would not be a concern in the future should the next door neighbour choose to extend in a similar way. The 1.5m set back would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.

There appears to be just one other property on Penrhyn Drive that has a two storey side extension and a few have single storey extensions. All the roofs along the street are hipped.

The proposed extension would have a hipped roof which would be set down from the original roof's ridge in order for the extension to remain subservient to the original dwelling.

There are several properties with porches to the front, which are similar to the proposed porch and the proposal to replace the red brick to the front elevation of the side extension and the porch with a darker colour and a rougher finished brick would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building.

The red brick (as built) finish would remain to the side and rear elevations of the side extension. The side elevation would be partially visible in the streetscape along Penrhyn Drive but given that no.11 next door is a red brick property, with a red brick garage extension directly adjacent to the shared boundary it would not appear intrusive in terms of visual amenity in this location.

The design and finished materials of the proposed extension and porch would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building and would be acceptable in this location and the 1.5m set back at first floor level from the original front elevation means the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of 'terracing' and the effect on the 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 -

- Separation distances to properties at the front and rear of the site from the two storey side extension would be more than acceptable and there would be around 7.5m from the rear elevation of the extension to the rear boundary. This would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6. As such it is considered that there would not be any significant detrimental impact on residential amenity at properties to the front or rear of the site.
- As the two storey extension would be built on the north side of the existing dwelling it would not have any seriously detrimental effect on residential amenity at no.15a attached to the south side.
- At the front there would be approximately 5.5m of drive length remaining to the front of the extension and the position of the porch would not have any detrimental impact on the ability to park a vehicle on site.
- The position of the porch would not have any significant detrimental effect on residential amenity at either of the adjacent neighbours as it would be built well away from both side boundaries.
- There would be no windows in the side elevation facing no.11 to the north side and there is a garage adjacent to the shared boundary at no.11.
- As the extension would not project excessively past the front and rear elevations at no.11 it is considered that it would not have any more of an impact on sun/daylight accessing the rear garden than the existing building on site does already.
- The applicant has stated that all of the development would be within the residential curtilage.

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 parking restrictions to the highway in front and there is public transport available nearby. In this instance then the parking arrangements are considered

sufficient.

Revised Drawings -

Revised drawings were received on 15/12/2025 and the objectors were notified of the proposed changes. Further revised drawings were received on 16/02/2026 which showed the projection of the front porch reduced to 1.2m and the porch, and the front elevation of the proposed side extension would be finished with bricks to match the existing building. The side and rear elevations would remain with a red brick finish and a further revised drawing was received on 27/02/2026 showing that the porch roof would be mono-pitched to reflect the single storey mono-pitched roof to the front of the side extension.

The neighbours were not notified of the final proposed drawings as the revisions to the size of the porch, its design and the finished materials have addressed the objections and the changes are considered acceptable in terms of Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Response to neighbour objections -

Most of the neighbour objections have been addressed in the visual and residential amenity sections of the report above.

With regards to the original drawings one neighbour advised that it appeared like there may be a balcony and window to the rear which would directly overlook their garden. This may have been due to the fact the applicant had started to build the first floor set in from the rear elevation. No balcony was shown on the proposed drawings. There would have been a standard window to the rear elevation but following receipt of revised drawings showing the rear elevation flush with the original rear wall it is clear that a balcony is not part of the proposal.

One neighbour also had concerns about the workmanship in terms of the building of the extension and they also asked if the revised drawings meant that the whole structure would be removed and rebuilt. An email was sent to this particular neighbour advising that if there are any concerns about the way the extension is being built a Building Control officer would liaise with the applicant direct, and that this is not part of the planning process. The neighbour was provided with the general contact number and email for the Council Building Control team and advised to contact that team if they have any Building Control queries.

Conclusion -

The revised proposal is considered acceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity and conforms to the Bury Unitary Development Plan Policy No H2/3 – Extensions and Alterations and the Development Control Policy Guidance Note 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

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 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 drawings numbered 01/12/24/A, 02/15/24/A and 05/15/24 A revision 1 received on 09/09/2025, section drawing numbered 05/15/24/A received on 17/11/2025, proposed floor plan drawing numbered 04/15/24/A Revision 4 received on 16/02/2026 and proposed elevations drawing numbered 04/15/24/A Revision 5 received on 27/02/2026 as modified by the emails from Mr Adil Sedik dated 16/02/2026 and 27/02/2026. 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 be Anglian red multi rustic bricks to the front porch and the front elevation of the side extension as confirmed by way of the brick sample submitted on 12/02/2026. The side and rear elevations of the two storey extension shall be finished with red bricks.
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 - 27/02/2026			