

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 27/05/2026	Ref: 73010/FUL
Registration: 16/04/2026	LDfC: 14/05/2026	Expiry Date: 11/06/2026
Site Visit: 29/04/2026	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 rear extension; Hip to gable roof extension with loft conversion and rear dormer

Location: 9 James Street North, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1QQ

Description

The property is an end terrace with a small garden to the front. To the rear it has a two storey out rigger across part of the elevation. A rear yard enclosed by a brick wall leads on to a back access street.

The application proposes a hip to gable roof extension and a flat roofed rear dormer to add a bedroom with ensuite. Rooflights would be added to the front slope. To the rear a single storey extension would come out at the side of the existing outrigger, which is 2.7m deep, and run across to the boundary. It would extend the kitchen area.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Surrounding neighbours were notified by letter and no responses have been received.

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 hip to gable extension would be acceptable with the area characterised by terraces and with side gables. Materials for the extended wall would be render to match the existing. The rear dormer would be flat roofed and extend across the majority of the roof slope with a set in of 0.2m to the sides and back from the eaves. The walls would be tile hung to match the existing roof. It would result in a typical style of roof extension and which can generally be constructed under permitted development. The single storey rear extension would be flat roofed with patio doors to the rear and steps up to the garden which is at a slightly higher level. The extension walls would be in render to match the existing.

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 has no off street parking and there is no scope to create any being in a terraced area with only on street parking. The additional bedroom created would be to the dormer and which is a development that can generally be constructed under permitted development .

DELEGATED REPORT

For the reasons stated there are not considered to be any grounds for refusal with regard to parking.

Residential amenity - The rear dormer would face towards the side gable wall to 2 Joseph Street which is blank at first floor. The single storey at the rear would run as blank wall along the boundary with the adjoining No.11 and be under 3m deep at 2.7m.

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.

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 Sheet 1, Sheet 2, Sheet 3, Sheet 4, Sheet 5, Sheet 6, Sheet 7 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>
JL	27/05/26	DM	29.05.26