

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 10/09/2025

Ref:72150/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 05/08/2025

LDfC: 26/08/2025

Expiry Date: 30/09/2025

Site Visit: 19/08/2025

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: NONE

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey front extension

Location: 4 Croft Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 2SE

Description

The application relates to a semi-detached house in the village of Simister, Prestwich which has been previously extended to the rear. The whole of the village is within the designated Green Belt. Croft Avenue is a small cul-de-sac, just off Simister Lane.

The proposal is to build a single storey front extension which would extend the existing study and hallway. The extension would project 1.6m forward of the existing front elevation and it would measure 4.78m wide. The roof would be pitched.

Relevant Planning History

43403 - First floor rear extension - Approve with Conditions 26/10/2004

64346 - Two storey/first floor and single storey extension at rear - Approve with Conditions 23/08/2019

Publicity

7 neighbours notified on 05/08/2025 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

SPD8 DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

OL1 Green Belt

OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt

PfE Places for Everyone

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

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.

The main considerations of this application are the impact of the proposal on visual and residential amenity, as well as the impact of the development on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt.

Principle (Green Belt)

Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF regards the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as

inappropriate development. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.
- h) Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
 - i. mineral extraction;
 - ii. engineering operations;
 - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
 - iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
 - v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
 - vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Policy OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for agriculture and forestry; essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings provided that this would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling; and limited infilling in existing villages as set out under Policy OL1/3.

This is further supported by Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt which state that extensions of existing dwellings should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. To assist in what can be considered to be disproportionate SPD 8 considers additions of up to a third (33%). However, that is not to say something larger, or smaller than 33%, would not be supported as each case is considered on its own merits.

The agent has stated in the Green Belt statement submitted that the extension would equate to just 4.87% increase in volume compared to the existing dwelling. Although this may be correct in terms of the increase to the existing dwelling, the agent does not appear to have taken the previously built extensions to the rear of the property into account.

According to the Green Belt statement for the previous approved development (ref 64346) those extensions resulted in a 30% volume increase of the original dwelling. This means the proposed single storey front extension would most likely result in overall extensions equating to just over the recommended 33% as stated in SPD 6. However, the property is located on a small cul-de-sac just off the main road which runs through Simister Village and there are many different types of properties in the close vicinity which have also been

extended. The extension would be built well within the residential curtilage of the site and the proposed development would not result in an over developed site. With this in mind the proposal would not have any seriously detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would comply with NPPF paragraphs 153 and 154, OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt and Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt.

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 proposed single storey front extension would be constructed with a design and finished materials that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building. As there are different styles of properties along Croft Lane the design and position of the extension would not have any significant detrimental impact on the character of the existing streetscene.

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, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

Residential Amenity -

- As the extension would be to the front elevation of the dwelling there would be no detrimental impact on properties to the rear.
- The separation distance to properties at the front would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- The extension would be positioned away from the shared boundary with no.2 Croft Lane. As such there would be no significant detrimental effect on residential amenity at that property.
- The extension would project 1.6m forward of the original front elevation, which means it would be around 550mm forward of the existing bay window. The gap between the property and the shared boundary with no.6 would remain, and there is a driveway adjacent at no.6. As such it is considered that the proposed extension would not have any significant detrimental impact on residential amenity at no.6 next door.
- The front of the site currently has parking space available all the way across the front of the house. Once the extension is built part of the area would be reduced to a sub-standard drive length. However, there would still be a drive length of around 6m remaining to the north west side of the site where one vehicle could park. The applicant would also have the available room to park a second vehicle across the front of the house (although not ideal).
- There would be one new window to the east side elevation. As this would be a bathroom the window would be obscurely glazed, but a condition would be added to the decision to ensure that this window remains obscurely glazed at all times in the future in order to retain privacy levels between the application property and no.6 Croft Lane next door.

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 in terms of separation distance to the surrounding properties.

Parking -

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms therefore SPD 11 Parking Standards need not be considered. There would be space to park two vehicles at the front of the site, there are no parking restrictions to the highway in front and there is public transport available close by. In this instance the parking arrangements would be considered acceptable.

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 WD2.1, WD2.2, WD3.1, WD3.2, WD3.3, WD5.1, WD5.2, WD5.3 and WD5.4 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 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, 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.
- 4 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the new window on the east side elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
Reason. To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers and to accord with 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>
AU 9/9/25		DM - 11/09/2025	