

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 20/12/2024	Ref: 71240/FUL
Registration: 29/10/2024	LDFC: 25/11/2024	Expiry Date: 24/12/2024
Site Visit: 05/12/2024	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
11:00:00		
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey side extension

Location: 264 Bolton Road, Tottington, Bury, BL8 4JN

Description

he property is an end terraced house. It has a path/garden along the side which leads round to a patio to the rear of the house and a raised garden. To the rear the house has a two storey outrigger across part of the rear elevation that is away from the party wall. The adjoining terrace No.266 is extended at the rear single storey approximately 3.2m deep. Beyond the rear boundary is open land and the site and surrounding area is within the Green Belt.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of two storey side extension. The side extension would project 4300mm to the side and run 9557mm to the rear to align with the principal rear elevation. The extension would have a setback of 3600mm from the front elevation. The development would facilitate a lounge on the ground floor and a bedroom with ensuite bathroom on the first floor. The proposal would be constructed with matching materials and the extension would have a pitched roof.

Relevant Planning History

61885 - Prior notification for proposed single storey rear extension - Prior Approval Required Refused - ExtPrior Approval Required Refused - Ext 11/09/2017
61953 - Single storey extension at rear - Approve with Conditions 20/11/2017
71350 - T1 Sycamore. Fell to ground level. - ZZZ Special deleted application 13/11/2024

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent. 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

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.

Issues and Analysis

Green Belt

The application site is located in the Green Belt and as such, paragraph 149 is relevant.

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings would be inappropriate in the Green Belt. 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.

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 if 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 OL/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 disproportionate SPD 8 considers additions of up to a third (33%) of the volume of the original dwelling, notwithstanding other material planning considerations such as design and visual appearance. 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.

In this instance, the proposed side extension would result a 30% increase. This would be well within the 33% limit stated on SPD 8. Overall, the proposed development would perseve the openess of the green belt.

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.

SPD 6 states, to avoid the appearance of uncharacteristic terracing, the front elevation at first floor level should be set back by at least 1.5m from the main frontage of the original dwelling. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a set back distance of 3.6m which would be acceptable in this instance.

The proposal consists of a two-storey side extension with a simple and unobtrusive design that would not detract from the character of the dwelling. The development would be in keeping with the existing structue and would be constructed using matching materials.

Overall the proposed development would not overwhelm the existing 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, or street scene and would therefore comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension would have two proposed windows to the side. However given the property's corner location and its vast distance to the nearest property, it would be considered acceptable. Furthermore, there would be sufficient distance to the front and rear boundaries and no houses beyond.

The proposed two storey side extension would not project beyond the principal front and rear elevations and as such, there would be no detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the attached property (No. 268).

Overall, there would be no serious impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore conforms to UDP Policy H2/3 Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 - 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 the drawings received on 29/10/2024 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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
MW	20/12/2024	DM -	20/12/2024