

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Steven Gunn
Russell

Date of report: 11/04/2022

Ref:68044/FUL

Registration: 03/02/2022

LDfC: 04/03/2022

Expiry Date: 31/03/2022

Site Visit: 17/02/2022

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: Single storey rear extension

Location: 10 Parkstone Avenue, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 7QH

Description

The application relates to a bungalow on a residential cul-de-sac of alongside other bungalows. There is an existing single storey extension at the rear and the neighbour has a single storey extension on the other side plus garden room outbuilding along the shared boundary. The neighbours to the rear have trees and shrubs on the boundary.

Planning permission is sought for an unusually shaped single-storey extension that would project out to the rear boundary and side boundary and have a flat roof. Materials would match the existing extension including white render and red brick for the walls, tiled flat roof, black UPVC windows, black composite doors, and timber fences.

There would be zero separation to the rear boundary, although there would be no windows directly overlooking any boundary which includes existing tree and shrub planting.

It should be noted that some work has been carried out at the front of the property involving the construction of a 2m high fence along the front boundary which is not part of this planning application and enforcement is aware of this.

Relevant Planning History

63380 - Front porch; single storey rear extension, garage conversion including the addition of a pitched roof and dormer extension at rear - Approve with Conditions 28/11/2018

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 11/02/2022 sent to 3 (three) neighbours. No representations were received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury

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) and 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 Policy 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 - UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to achieve a high standard of design that compliments the original building, does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of neighbouring properties, and protects the general street scene.

In terms of design and appearance the extension is generally in-keeping with the existing house and previous extension. Situated at the rear, the extension would not be readily visible from the public arena. Materials would match existing and there would be a series of vertical windows evenly spaced out matching the existing fenestration. In this respect the extension complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Residential amenity - UDP policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

In terms of overlooking and privacy to the rear, the zero-separation distance to the rear boundary from the extension is considered to be acceptable given that no windows would directly overlook any boundaries or neighbours and therefore complies with adopted guidance in SPD6. The existing tree and shrub planting along the rear boundary would further reduce the impact on the residents to the rear.

The extension is acceptable in relation to the attached neighbour as it complies with the '45-degree rule' within SPD6.

In terms of the general prominence and impact on daylight the extension is set off the shared side boundary and is to the south of No.8. The extension is entirely single storey and would have a minimal impact on part of the neighbours rear garden in the mornings and midday (which includes a north facing garden summer house alongside the boundary) but any overshadowing would not be seriously excessive above and beyond the existing situation. In this respect the extension would not have such a serious impact on the outlook from No.8 to warrant refusal.

The extension would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Highways – No changes proposed as part of this application.

Conclusion – In consideration of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of the design, and sitting, of this development. As such, the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

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 1021_04 Proposed, and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.

DELEGATED REPORT

Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury Unitary 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.

- 4 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the toilet windows at the side elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason. To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers and to accord with 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>
SGR	11/04/2022		