

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 24/06/2026	Ref: 73007/FUL
Registration: 21/05/2026	LDfC: 22/06/2026	Expiry Date: 16/07/2026
Site Visit: 03/06/2026	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: HOUS

Proposal: First floor side extension and two/single storey extension at side/rear

Location: 45 Holyrood Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1PE

Description

The property is a semi detached house located at the top of a cul de sac. It has garden and a drive to the front which leads to a detached garage. The house has been extended single storey at the side and with a conservatory at the rear. The rear garden is fenced and the rear boundary backs on to properties at 9-17 Noreen Ave.

The application includes the removal of the conservatory and construction of an extension to the rear 4m deep at ground floor across the full elevation. A first floor would project 1.1m deep at the rear set 2m in from the boundary with the adjoining property and run for 7m across where it would wrap around to the side above the existing single storey for 5.7m along. The extensions would form a kitchen extension, bathroom and bedroom at ground floor and an additional bedroom with ensuite and study at first floor. It is also proposed to remove the garage to the side drive and provide 2 parking spaces in the side garden.

Relevant Planning History

28079 - Conservatory at rear - AC 23/03/93

18599 - Single storey extension at side - AC 26/08/86

Publicity

Surrounding neighbours were notified by letter on 28/05/26. Further letters were sent 10/06/26 regarding the reduction in rear extension and the new parking arrangements.

Two responses have been received from nearby neighbours their concerns in summary are

- Can you confirm now a 5 bed property that this will not be a HMO
- The form asks are there any trees or hedges within falling distance of the proposed plans It is ticked "no" this is incorrect. Conifers are within falling distance of the planned application so would maybe need making shorter.
- Overlooking to the rear if trees/conifers removed
- Plans appear to be at the permitted maximum
- Large extension likely overbearing

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 - The proposed first floor extension would have a pitched roof set below the main ridge and forming a side gable wall. There would be a drive width to the side boundary and the property sits at the top of a cul de sac. In terms of the main street view the proposal would be of an acceptable design. To the rear the single storey would have a monopitch roof and at first floor form a gable. Materials are noted to be brick and

tiles and for the avoidance of doubt the standard matching materials condition is added.

The proposal is considered acceptable and in keeping with the existing property and would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

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 3 parking spaces. The site currently has a drive that runs from the front and along the side to a detached garage. The garage would be demolished and two vehicles spaces provided within the side garden and the drive would remain and could provide further parking. As such, the parking arrangements are acceptable.

Residential amenity - The attached No.58 is extended single storey to the site boundary and then two storey. The proposed single storey would project less than 3m from the rear of the single storey of No.58 and where two storey would be 1.1m deep and set 2m in from the shared boundary.

To the opposite side No.43 sits across the side garden to the site and proposed first floor would be blank wall.

The proposal has been revised from that as originally submitted to set back the first floor in order to meet aspect standards which require a minimum 7m separation from a first floor habitable room window to a rear boundary. In addition, the windows would now both be non habitable as an ensuite and study. The properties to the rear would also be over 13m away.

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

The proposal complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Response to comment

There are permitted development rights for properties to become a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) however this application is for a householder extension and is assessed as such.

It is the case that there are conifers on site however there are no protected trees to be of concern to the application.

The proposal has been reduced in order to meet SPD6 Aspect Standards which are set out in order to provide adequate privacy distances and to which the proposal complies.

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:

DELEGATED REPORT

- 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 RAD/3515/26/1/RevB & RAD/3515/26/2/RevB received 15/06/26 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 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>
JL	24/06/26	HL 26.06.2026	