

Description

The application property is a two storey semi-detached house with a single storey side extension. At the rear there is a private garden with fences to all boundaries and some planting to the side boundaries.

The proposal is to build a single storey rear extension. It would project 4m from the existing rear elevation and would extend across the whole of the rear elevation. It would provide a ground floor bedroom and wet room along with a kitchen extension. The roof would be hipped.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

Neighbours notified on 29/06/2023 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions -Not relevant**Unitary Development Plan and Policies**

<SQLDCPolicyComRep>

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.

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 extension would be built with materials and a design that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building and as it would be built on the rear of the dwelling it would only be visible from the rear gardens of nearby neighbours. The extension would not have any significant detrimental effect on visual amenity in this area.

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.

Residential Amenity -

- The extension would be around 10m away from the rear boundary, which would be more than acceptable in terms of aspect standard distances relating to single storey extensions in SPD 6.
- There would be no windows in either side elevation.
- The plan shows that the north side elevation would be around 250mm away from the shared boundary with the attached property and it would be a similar distance from the southern boundary. As such there would be no concern regards encroachment on to the neighbouring land.
- The extension would project 4m from the original rear elevation. As there have been no neighbour objections this projection would be acceptable in terms of the Larger Homes Scheme.

Taking the above into account 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.

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 two vehicles and there is a garage. This would remain following the rear extension being built. The area is high access in terms of public transport and there are no parking restrictions to the road in front. In this instance then the parking

arrangements are considered sufficient.