

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 09/06/2026	Ref: 73106/FUL
Registration: 21/04/2026	LDFC: 28/05/2026	Expiry Date: 16/06/2026
Site Visit: 14/05/2026	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 front extension; Single storey side/rear extension

Location: 230 Market Street, Bury, BL9 9AB

Description

The property is a red brick bay fronted semi detached house located in a row of 5 pairs. It has garden to the front and a drive that runs along the side leading to a detached garage. The house has been extended with a hip to gable roof extension with a flat roofed rear dormer and a single storey across the rear elevation.

The application proposes a two storey front extension 2m deep and 2.8m wide to the front entrance side of the property. The ground floor would extend out at the side single storey by a further 2m and run along the side and 6m beyond the rear elevation and wrap around the width of the rear elevation. The extensions would form an extended bedroom at first floor. At ground floor a hall, wc, laundry and extended living room and kitchen.

Relevant Planning History

43489 - First floor rear extension - AC 12/11/2004
31755 - Single storey extension at rear - AC 22/02/96
29005 - First floor extension at side - Refused 03/03/94

Publicity

Surrounding neighbours were notified by letter and no responses have been received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
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.

Visual amenity and design - SPD6 Section 3 General Guidance requires proposals to achieve a high standard of design and that complements the original building by reflecting its design, massing, scale and finishing materials.

SPD6 Section 4.4 Front Extensions has a general presumption against large extensions at the front of properties due to the need to protect the character of the street scene.

The application has been revised from the original submission to hip the roof to the single storey side extension and finish the walls in matching brickwork instead of white render to all walls. It was also requested to reduce the two storey front extension to single storey however the applicant has declined this as they state that they require the extended bedroom for a family member.

The section of Market Street that the site is located consists of properties of a similar design and this provides the prevailing character of the street scene. It is noted that the site has been extended with a hip to gable extension, however this can be carried out as permitted development. Whilst the revised roof design to the single storey, and the change

in materials to matching brickwork, significantly improve the scheme the proposed two storey front would still appear out of character and intrusive in the street.

In conclusion, at this particular location, it is considered that the proposal would result in an incongruous development and would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. Therefore the proposal would conflict with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Parking - The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms where SPD6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered. The proposed side extension would be built on part of the drive along the side however there would be a remaining drive length in excess of 5m remaining and there is potential to create additional parking in the front garden should the applicant require it. The site is also located in close proximity to the main town centre with public transport. As such, the parking arrangements are considered acceptable. .

Residential amenity - The proposed two storey front extension would not be located in close proximity to the neighbouring properties. The side extension would be to the side to No. 232 and have 3 small slim windows to the side to non habitable rooms as the kitchen, laundry and wc. It would also be separated by the drive to No.232. This neighbouring property is extended two/single storey at the rear and the proposal would not come more than 3m from its rear as extended.

To the opposite side the attached No.228 is extended with a conservatory at the rear and the proposed extension would be blank wall to the side and extend less than 3m from the rear of No.228 as extended.

There would then be no serious impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbouring properties.

As the proposal would be contrary to UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties with regard to the two storey front extension it is recommended that the application be refused.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed two storey extension to the front of the property would, by reason of size, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and associated Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

DELEGATED REPORT

<u>Case Officer</u> JL	<u>Date</u> 09/06/26	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
---------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------