

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 10/11/2025	Ref: 72388/FUL
Registration: 17/09/2025	LDFC: 29/10/2025	Expiry Date: 12/11/2025
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey and first floor rear extensions

Location: 26 Hereford Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0AG

Description

Two storey semi-detached dwelling on a residential street. There is driveway to the side and a hedge surrounds the perimeter of the site. There are gardens to the front and rear and the adjacent properties on either side are No.24 and No.28 (attached) Hereford Drive.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension projecting 4.4m to the rear and a first floor rear extension extending 2.8m to the rear. The development would accommodate a new dinner room on the ground floor and a bedroom extension on the first floor. The first floor extension would have a pitched roof while the single storey element would have a flat roof with roof lantern. Materials would match existing.

Relevant Planning History

45114 - TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT SIDE & SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT FRONT & REAR - Approve with Conditions 30/09/2005

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent on 07/10/2025. 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

UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to achieve a high standard of design that complements the original building, does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of neighbouring properties, and protects the general street scene.

The proposed development would be simple and unobtrusive design and would not detract from the character of the dwelling. Furthermore, development would be to the rear of the site and therefore would be visible from the street scene at the front.

The single rear and first floor rear extensions would be considered suitably in scale. The proposal would match existing materials and not overwhelm the dwelling or result in over development of the associated residential amenity space. It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling, street scene or neighbouring properties and would therefore comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6.

Residential amenity

UDP policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

SPD states that a single storey extension should not project more than 3m along a neighbouring boundary, at which point the 45° rule would be applied. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project 4.4 metres to the rear. However, taking in to account the Larger Homes Scheme and that the adjacent neighbours have not objected the projection of 4.4 metres along the shared boundary would be considered acceptable in this instance.

In terms of overlooking and privacy to the rear, the new first floor habitable room windows would have sufficient separation distance to the rear boundary. Furthermore, there would be no new side windows proposed. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and complies with adopted guidance in SPD6.

There would be no encroachments caused by the first floor extension, following the application of the 45-degree rule. The proposed extension would project by 2.8m to the rear and as such would be acceptable in relation to the attached neighbour and the adjacent neighbour on the opposite side. Therefore, the proposed first floor extension would not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of either neighbour.

The proposed extension would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Highways

The proposal will not result in changes to the parking layout. Therefore, the driveway at its current condition would meet the maximum parking requirements.

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 Dwg no. GSS25111.1 003 Rev. 3, Dwg no. GSS25111.1 502 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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
MW	10/11/2025	DM -	11/11/2025