

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 06/11/2020	Ref: 66027/GPDE
Registration: 02/10/2020	LDfC: 30/10/2020	Expiry Date: 13/11/2020
Site Visit: 14/10/2020	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: NREQ

Proposal: Prior notification for proposed single storey rear extension

Location: 19 Danesmoor Drive, Bury, BL9 6ER

Description

A Prior Approval Application for a larger home extension to a semi-detached 2 storey dwellinghouse.

Relevant Planning History

N/a

Publicity

Letters sent to adjacent properties on 8/10/20.
No response received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/a

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

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.

Unless a formal written objection is received from any of notified addresses as prescribed by the regulations, within the prescribed 21 days following the date of such notification prior approval will not be required as the proposed development complies with all the limitations and conditions of Part 1 Class A of the GPDO (as amended).

The dwelling is not Listed nor is it in a Conservation Area.

There is no enforcement and the proposed development would be on land wholly owned or controlled by the applicant. The plans submitted with the application, plan ref 20/580/02A, show that 'no part of the extension above or below ground, including eaves, gutter and foundations to encroach over the boundary'.

Permitted Development Rights have not been removed.

The proposal would not take up more than 50% of the area of the curtilage, not including the area of the dwelling.

The proposal would not extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by more than than six metres.

The proposed development would not extend beyond a wall which forms the principal or a side elevation of the original dwelling and fronts a highway.

The overall height of the proposal would not exceed four metres and the height to the eaves would not exceed three metres. The proposed extension would not more than half the width of the original dwelling.

Having regard to the above the proposal would be lawful as it falls within the limitations of Part 1 Class A to Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

DELEGATED REPORT

Recommendation: Prior Approval Not Required

Conditions and Reasons:

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT	6/11/20	DM	10/11/2020