

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Charlotte Orrell	Date of report: 19/03/2026	Ref: 72416/FUL
Registration: 11/12/2025	LDfC: 20/03/2026	Expiry Date: 05/02/2026
Site Visit: 04/02/2026	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: Two/single storey side extension; two/single storey front extensions, two/single storey rear extensions; roof terrace to rear

Location: 10 Park Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1EW

Description

The application property is a two storey detached dwelling on the eastern side of Park Avenue. The boundary to the front is open with brick paving separating the front elevation of the property and the pavement. The access to the rear garden at the northern side is currently overgrown. To the southern side, there is an access gate to the rear garden for pedestrians. Timber fencing and vegetation form the boundaries to the rear of the site.

The proposal is to build a two/single storey side extension together with two storey and single storey front extensions. To the rear a two/single storey extension is proposed together with a roof terrace.

The proposed two/single storey side extension would project 5.4m from the original northern side elevation of the property and would span 9.2m at ground floor and a maximum of 6.4m at first floor. It would incorporate a gable roof matching the existing ridge height and 5.4m to the eaves at first floor. At ground floor, it would incorporate a pitched roof to the front a maximum of 3.4m in height, with 2.8m to the eaves. To the rear, the single storey element would incorporate a flat roof a maximum of 2.6m in height to facilitate the proposed roof terrace.

The proposed single storey side extension would project 4.3m from the proposed northern side elevation of the two storey side extension before projecting to the front of the property. It would incorporate a flat roof a maximum of 3m in height.

The proposed two storey front extension would project 0.6m from the original front elevation of the property, and would replace the existing rounded bay windows with square bays. It would be 2.9m in width across the original front elevation and would incorporate a gable roof feature a maximum height of 6.4m and an eaves height of 5.3m.

The single storey front extension would project 0.2m from the original front elevation, would be 1.3m in width and would incorporate a flat roof a maximum of 2.7m in height.

The proposed single storey rear extension would project a further 0.8m at ground floor from the existing rear extension at the property and would project a further 3.6m from the original rear elevation at first floor. It would span 6.5m in width and would incorporate a hipped roof to match the height of the existing property, with an eaves height of 5.2m.

The proposed roof terrace would project 1.3m from the rear elevation of the proposed first floor side extension and would be 4.2m in width. It would be a maximum of 2.6m in height.

The street scene is residential in nature, predominantly of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Parking at the locality is mixed with some properties featuring private driveways for 1-2 cars but parking on street is unrestricted and therefore common.

Amendments

Amendments to the scheme were sought in order to remove a two storey flat roof front extension as well as reducing the height of the proposed single storey pitched roof to the proposed ground floor front element of the side extension.

Relevant Planning History

35181/99 - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT THE REAR - Approved with Conditions
04/05/1999

72337 - Enlargement/Extensions of Existing Detached House - Withdrawn by Applicant
15/09/2025

Publicity

21 neighbouring properties were consulted on 11/12/2025. Amended neighbour letters with an amended description of the development were sent on 12/03/2026. Two comments were received from two neighbouring properties detailing the below concerns:

- 8 trees have been felled already raising concerns around wildlife.
- Concern over whether the trees will be replaced
- Concern over whether any trees be lost in the course of the development
- The houses in the triangle of Park Avenue, Rectory Lane and Heywood Road have gardens which have many mature trees. Together they give the impression of a woodland environment with much bird life and wildlife. Over the years this woodland area has been thinned out by different house-owners at different times and it would be a shame to see any further erosion.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
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

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.

Due to the siting of the property, the two/single storey side extension would be sited in the top corner of the cul-de-sac at Park Avenue, out of view from the majority of the street scene and so would have a limited impact. The roofing proposed is to match the height of the existing property at two storey level and it would be set back at first floor as to appear as a consistent addition. The single storey front element of the proposed two/single storey side extension would also incorporate a pitched roof, favoured over flat roofing and so remaining well designed in relation to guidance outlined within SPD 6.

The proposed single storey side extension would incorporate a flat roof, considered acceptable as the proposed is single storey. It would also appear consistent within the street scene as would be used as a garage, appearing similar to that of the neighbouring property to the north and therefore being in keeping within the street scene.

The proposed two storey front extension would mean that the existing bay windows appearance is changed from being curved to square. This is not uncommon within the street scene and so would not be an unacceptable amendment. Furthermore, despite two storey front extensions not being common within the street scene, the proposed would only be projecting a further 0.6m which would not be overly dominant. Sited at the end of the

street, it would not be an intrusive feature within the street scene either.

The proposed single storey front extension would project just 0.2m from the existing front elevation of the property. Although it would have a flat roof, which is not usually favoured, it is single storey and other properties in the area feature flat roof single storey porches. Given this, it would not appear out of character.

The proposed rear extension and roof terrace are sited to the rear of the property and therefore out of view from the street scene. They would therefore have limited impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Materials proposed are to match that of the existing dwelling, and bin storage will be retained to the rear for storage on non-collection days.

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-

In terms of the neighbour to the south, 8 Park Avenue, the proposed rear extension would be sited 2m from the boundary. Together with the fact that 8 Park Avenue also benefits from a two storey rear extension, this would mean that the proposed would not impinge on any habitable room windows at a 45 degree angle. Furthermore, there are no habitable room windows proposed facing this property, only a door serving the utility and a bathroom window proposed to be obscure glazed. The proposed roof terrace would also be sited behind the proposed rear extension, offering limited views into the neighbouring property and not causing any further overlooking impacts than exist. Sited away from the other proposals, there would be no impact.

In terms of the neighbour to the north, there are no habitable windows in the side elevation of this property that would be impacted by the proposals. There are two dressing room windows proposed facing this property however these are acknowledged within the conditions to be obscure glazed to prevent any privacy impacts. Given the orientation of the properties, this property would also not have any habitable room windows impacted by the proposals at a 45 degree angle and the proposed balcony area would not offer unobstructed views into the neighbours property due to the set back proposed.

Neighbours to the front would retain 20m of interface distance with the proposals being sited approximately 7m from the rear boundary line at two storey. Given properties to the rear are sited at a higher ground level to the application property, they are unlikely to be impacted.

Parking-

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4 and SPD 6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered.

The dwelling is sited within Zone 4 and therefore the parking standards for 4 bedroom properties and greater is 3 off road parking spaces. There is currently one off road car parking space at the property. The proposal would potentially improve this arrangement by having an off road space contained within the proposed garage as well as remodelling the front paved area of the application property for car parking use too. Given this, and the fact that parking in the area is unrestricted and common, this would be considered acceptable.

Trees

It was noted from the officer's site visit that trees line the side/rear boundary of the rear garden and as such could be impacted by the proposed. The trees are not subject to a TPO and the site is not located within a Conservation Area.

Further tree information was sought, and a tree plan was submitted detailing which trees would be removed. 7 trees lining the side boundary to the north/east of the site were necessary to be removed on Tree Surgeon advice, due to the trees being diseased and therefore being dangerous in regards to the stability of the embankment. A tree on the south-east corner of the site was not considered to be diseased or dangerous and as such will be retained.

Given the above, the proposals impact on the trees is considered acceptable. An informative will be added to the decision notice detailing how appropriate landscaping at the site to replace the existing trees should be undertaken.

Response to Objectors-

Any concerns regarding birds/wildlife should be directed to the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. An informative has been acknowledged in the decision notice advising the applicant of the laws surrounding wildlife discovered during development.

All other concerns have been addressed within the body of the report.

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:

- 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 A.02.2 Rev A, A.02.3 Rev B, and A.02.7, 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.
- 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 The proposed flat roof to the single storey side extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony.

DELEGATED REPORT

Reason. To safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring residents and to comply with Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.

- 5 Notwithstanding the submitted details, upon first installation of the, first floor dressing room windows in the north-eastern side elevation of the proposed two storey side extension, hereby approved, facing No.12 Park Avenue, shall be either non opening or with openings more than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level and fitted with obscure glazing whose obscuration level is 5 on a scale of 1-5 (where 1 is clear and 5 is completely) of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy, outlook and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and in order to comply with UDP Policy H2/3.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
CO	19/03/2026		