

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 09/12/2025	Ref: 72350/FUL
Registration: 24/10/2025	LDfC: 05/11/2025	Expiry Date: 19/12/2025
Site Visit: 19/11/2025	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: Single storey side extension; Loft conversion with rear dormer

Location: 8 Carlton Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0EB

Description

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached brick/render house at the end of a residential cul-de-sac of similar styled properties. Driveway to the front/side and a single storey flat roof extension to the side/rear. The side boundary forms the rear boundary of gardens to properties on Rothesay Road to the east.

The proposal involves demolishing the existing single storey side extension and constructing a new mono-pitched single storey extension on the east side, running just over 10m from front to rear. It would project out 3.6m with a maximum roof pitch to 4.3m and eaves at 2.8m. The house and extension would be rendered.

The flat roof rear dormer would sit on the rear roof plane, approximately 600mm down from the main roof ridge and 250mm up from the eaves and in from the gable. The dormer would be finished in tiles to match the main roof.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 05/11/2025. No objections received.

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.

Visual amenity - The proposed extensions and alterations are relatively modest in scale and, at the end of the residential cul-de-sac, would not appear out of keeping with the house or congruous within the streetscape. In terms of visual amenity, the proposal is acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6 relating to extensions and alterations.

Residential Amenity - The single storey side extension runs parallel to the side boundary with rear gardens of neighbours to the east. Set back from the boundary by about 1m and with an eaves height of approximately 2.8m, there would be no serious impact on the neighbours on this side. The side windows in the side extension would be required to be obscure glazed to mitigate overlooking.

The rear dormer is set of the boundary with the attached neighbour and would appear to be 'permitted development' under the current legislation.

Given the size and siting of the extensions in relation to immediate neighbours, there are no residential amenity issues arising. The proposal is acceptable and complies with UDP

Policy H2/3 and guidance document SPD6 relating to extensions and alterations.

Parking and access - The existing parking and access would remain in situ and would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 in relation to parking.

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 001, 002, 003/1 and 301 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 Notwithstanding the approved plans, before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted, the three ground floor, full height, windows in the side/east elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing (Min obscurity level 3) 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	09/12/2025		