

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 26/02/2026	Ref: 72699/FUL
Registration: 02/01/2026	LDfC: 04/02/2026	Expiry Date: 27/02/2026
Site Visit: 03/02/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Dormer to the rear

Location: 4 Breeze Mount, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0AH

Description

The application relates to two storey semi-detached house on a road of similar styled properties. The house has been extended to the side and rear (see history below) and has a very small paved area at the rear. The attached property has not been extended and the unattached property to the north-east is a dormer bungalow with side windows facing across the site. The properties to the rear (Nos. 20 and 22 Woodhill Drive) are set down significantly just over the rear boundary.

It is proposed to add a rear box dormer on the rear roof plane. It would extend across 8.5m and be set up from the eaves and down from the main ridge. Clad in roof tiles to match the existing house. The dormer would allow for an additional bedroom and study.

Following concerns regarding overlooking, revised plans have been submitted indicating the two windows on the dormer as fixed and obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m.

Relevant Planning History

59612 - Single/two storey extensions at side and rear - Approve with Conditions 03/03/2016
16/0450 - Not being built in accordance with approved plans - 21/10/2016

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 13/01/2026. One objection received and summarised below:

- The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy due to the dormer overlooking the entire rear of our property.
- The development will restrict sunlight into our ground floor habitable rooms and the rear garden, due to the height of the property relative to ours. The dormer is located directly South-East to our property.
- Concern that the proposed development does not meet the distances criteria in 'SPD6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

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.

Permitted Development - Although with a volume of about 24 cubic metres, the dormer in isolation could be permitted development. However previous extensions to the house and have used up the 'permitted development quota' and therefore the proposal is assessed on the basis that it requires planning permission.

Visual amenity - The proposed dormer is at the rear and would not be particularly prominent when viewed from Breeze Mount. Set on high ground, the property is viewed quite readily from properties to the north and east, however rear dormers are not unusual

on properties and this does not raise any serious visual amenity concerns. The dormer is large but does not extend beyond the existing ridge and would be finished to match the main roof. The proposal is acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 relating to extensions.

Residential amenity - The proposed dormer would sit on the rear roof plane and be 6.7m from the rear boundary which is shared with Nos.20 and 22 Woodhill Drive. The dormer windows (bedroom and study), if clear glazed, would face over the rear boundary towards the properties at the rear. At a distance of only 6.7m to the boundary and at a second floor height, this separation distance is significantly less than what would be reasonable in this circumstance. After concerns were expressed, revised plans were submitted to indicate that the windows on the dormer would be fixed and obscure glazed to a minimum height of 1.7m. This would reduce potential overlooking and secure privacy to a reasonable degree.

In terms of overshadowing and daylight, the dormer, sitting on the rear roof plane and slightly below the main ridge, would not significantly increase overshadowing or have a seriously detrimental impact on light levels to the property at the rear.

With obscure glazing, the dormer would not significantly increase overlooking to the rear, and for this reason, the proposal would be acceptable and would comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6 Extensions and Alterations.

Public comments - The issues raised by the neighbour to the rear with regard to privacy and daylight have been addressed in the above report.

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 PL_001, 002, 003, 004, 005 and 006A (revised) 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 EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

DELEGATED REPORT

- 4 Before the first occupation of the roofspace, the windows in the rear dormer shall be fitted with fixed and obscured glazing to a minimum sill height of 1.7m 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>
Tom Beirne	26/02/2026		