

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 15/01/2026	Ref: 72572/FUL
Registration: 24/11/2025	LDFC: 22/12/2025	Expiry Date: 19/01/2026
Site Visit: 05/01/2026	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: Two storeysingle storey side/rear extension; Garage conversion; 2 no. bay windows to front elevation; Timber & metal cladding

Location: 62 Rectory Lane, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1BL

Description

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached, red brick, bay fronted dwelling on a residential road of similar styled properties. Driveway to the front and large garden to the rear. The attached neighbour at No.60 has a rear extension and the unattached neighbour has a detached garage on the shared side boundary at the rear. The same unattached neighbour has a kitchen/diner window in the side elevation facing the shared side boundary.

The proposal involves adding a flat roof two storey/single storey side/rear extension with the integral garage being converted to living accommodation. There would also be a two storey bay window added to the front to mirror the existing bay on the other side of the front door. The single storey element would be timber clad with the first floor element finished in a metal cladding.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 01/12/2025. 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

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 - Whilst the new bay and alterations to the frontage would be in keeping with the existing house, the flat roof design and cladding finish would contrast with the existing, more traditional styling of the existing house at the rear.

In terms of visual amenity, the proposal, with the side extension set back from the main frontage, would not appear incongruous within the Rectory Lane streetscape.

At the rear, there is a contrast in design and finish from the existing house however, views from the public arena would be very limited. The timber clad single storey element would not be so out of keeping on the side and rear and would be generally acceptable. Whilst the first floor element would be flat roofed with metal cladding, it would not project beyond the existing rear elevation by more than 1.5m. Although the side and rear extension would add a more contemporary element, it would sit relatively comfortably on the house.

On balance, the proposal is acceptable in terms of visual amenity and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance within SPD6.

Residential amenity - Given the extension on the rear of No.60 and the garage along the side boundary at No.64, the relationship to the extensions would not present any serious residential amenity issues. The window in the side of the unattached neighbour, facing the side extension, is a secondary side window that cannot be afforded significant weight. It is noted that there are no objections from neighbours.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 Extensions and Alterations.

Parking - With most houses having off-street parking in addition to on-street parking along Rectory Lane, there is no significant pressure on parking in the immediate area. The garage is being converted to living accommodation but the existing driveway would remain and accommodate one car. This is considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6 Extensions and Alterations with regard to parking.

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 E000, E100, E200, PL000, PL100 and PL200 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>
Tom Beirne	15/01/2026		