

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Steven Gunn

Date of report: 06/05/2022

Ref:68094/FUL

Russell

Registration: 15/02/2022

LDfC: 22/04/2022

Expiry Date: 12/04/2022

Site Visit: 08/03/2022

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: Proposed double storey side extension. Proposed rear flat roof dormer.

Location: 22 Fitzgerald Close, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9TB

Description

The application relates to a two-storey end terrace house on a residential cul-de-sac of generally similar properties. The attached neighbour has a single storey extension at the rear and the neighbour on the other side is as originally built. This street has a relatively irregular building line where this dwelling is set back slightly in relation to the neighbour at No.20.

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension that would be positioned within the existing front and rear building lines, project out to the shared boundary and have a gable roof carried over from the existing roof. Materials would match existing plus the dormer materials would be concrete tiles matching the existing roof tiles for the side and rear cheek walls, and fibre glass finishing for the flat roof. The windows would be dark grey upvc and the doors would be white/ dark grey upvc. There are no side windows proposed although there would be a dormer to the rear and three rooflights at the front. There would be a separation of 12.0m to the rear boundary, a fence approximately 1.7m high.

Relevant Planning History

None

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 23/02/2022 and 31/03/2022 sent to 5 (five) neighbours. No representations were received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

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) and 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 Policy 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 compliments the original building, does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of neighbouring properties, and protects the general street scene.

In terms of design and appearance the extension is generally in-keeping with the existing house. Situated at the front, side, and rear, the extension would be readily visible from the public arena, although its design and scale is considered to be appropriate for this property and streetscene. Materials would match existing plus new materials for the dormer.

It is noted that SPD6 normally requires side extensions to avoid contributing to a terracing effect. However, given that this street has a relatively irregular building line where this dwelling is set back slightly in relation to the neighbour at No.20, it is therefore considered to be acceptable. In this respect the extension complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

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

In terms of overlooking and privacy to the rear, the 12m separation distance to the rear boundary from the extension is considered to be acceptable and complies with adopted guidance in SPD6.

The extension is acceptable in relation to the attached neighbour as it complies with the '45-degree rule' within SPD6.

In terms of the general prominence and impact on daylight the extension is set off the shared side boundary and is to the east of No.20. The extension would have some impact on that neighbour's front garden in the mornings, but any overshadowing would not be seriously excessive above and beyond the existing situation.

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

Highways - The proposal would not affect the existing parking arrangements above.

Conclusion – In consideration of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of the design, and siting, of this development. As such, the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

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 HS2201/02 RevA. And HS2201/05 RevA 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 listed.
- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall match those

DELEGATED REPORT

of the existing building plus materials as specified for the dormer.

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>
SGR	06/05/2022		