

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 19/02/2026

Ref:72684/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 14/01/2026

LDFC: 06/02/2026

Expiry Date: 11/03/2026

Site Visit: 03/02/2026

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area:

Adv Type: N/A

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Raising of roof ridge height with front and rear dormers to form second floors at No. 57 and No. 59. First floor side extension; part two storey/part first floor rear extension at No. 57

Location: 57 & 59 Bishops Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0HS

Description

The application relates to a pair of previously extended, brick semi-detached properties on Bishops Road, Prestwich. Both properties have been extended to the rear and have existing sub-standard drive lengths to the front of the dwellings. Along both front boundaries there is a low brick wall with a hedge to the rear. The driveways open onto Bishops Road.

No.57 Bishops Road currently has a single storey side/rear extension. As the dwelling has a higher ground level compared to the rear garden there are two sets of steps from the existing kitchen and dining room for access to the rear garden.

No.59 has been extended at ground and first floor level, with an existing single/two storey rear extension. This property has a raised decked area to the rear of the house with steps down to the lower level garden. There are fences to all boundaries, to both rear gardens.

The proposal is to raise the ridge height of both properties with front and rear dormers and build a first floor side extension and a part single/two storey rear extension at no.57.

At no. 57 the side extension would measure approximately 2.3m wide and it would have an overall length of around 14m. At the front the first floor would be set back from the original front elevation by 1.5m and the single storey roof to the ground floor at the front would be hipped. At the rear the extension would measure a total of approximately 8.65m wide and it would be adjoining the existing single storey rear extension at no.59 next door. The first floor section of the rear extension would measure approximately 4.8m wide. The extensions to the rear would project around 4.54m from the original rear elevation, to the same point as the existing extension at no.59. The single storey roof would be flat with a Succah roof.

There would be no changes or additions to the ground and first floor at no.59 Bishops Road.

The ridge of both properties would be raised by approximately 1m above the highest point of both roofs and around 1.3m higher than the existing two storey side extension at no.59. The roof would be pitched.

The rear roof extension would be built directly up from the side elevations of the two storey extensions below, and the rear dormers would be positioned behind the walls. The flat roof would extend over the dormers and the proposed side elevation wall.

The dormers would be built on the original section of the roof, very slightly set back from the existing rear elevations, and part would be directly above the two storey rear extensions projecting around 4.54m beyond the original rear elevation. The roof extensions to both properties would be set back from the rear elevation by less than 100mm (measured from the proposed drawings) and would provide 4 new bedrooms and 3 bathrooms at each property.

At the front there would be a pitched roof dormer and two rooflights installed to both properties. The second floor level above the side extensions would be built to the same height as the rest of the roof and to the front there would be a dormer style window at both properties, set back from the front elevation of the proposed first floor level by approximately 1.6m.

No.57 Bishops Road currently has 4 bedrooms. The extended property would have 9 bedrooms. No.59 has 5 existing bedrooms and the extended property would result in 10 bedrooms.

Relevant Planning History

57 Bishops Road -

70992 - First floor rear/side extension; Single storey rear extension; Loft conversion with front & rear dormers - Approve with Conditions 01/10/2024

59 Bishops Road -

58190 - Single storey extension at front/side, two storey extension at side/rear and first floor/single storey extension at rear; Raised decking area at rear with steps to garden level - Approve the conditions 15/01/2015

59 & 61 Bishops Road -

Single storey extensions at front; Two storey extensions side/rear; Single storey extensions at rear; Raised patio with balustrade and steps down to garden level at no.59 and 61 - Approved with conditions 24/04/2015

Publicity

8 neighbours notified on 18/01/2026 - 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
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
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.

The main considerations of this application are the impact of the proposal on visual and residential amenity.

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 finished materials would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building.

The increased ridge height would result in the no.57 being approximately 1.2m higher than no.55 Bishops Road to the south and no.59 would be approximately 300mm higher than the ridge of the main dwelling at no.61, and 1m higher than the side extension at that property.

Whilst it may be acceptable to raise the ridge height of the pair of semis, the pitch of the new roof would be too steep compared to the adjacent dwellings, resulting in the two properties appearing over-dominant in the existing streetscene. The impact of the increased ridge height in the streetscene would be heightened due to the proposed pitched

and flat roof dormers to the front.

The pitched roof dormer and rooflights to the front may be acceptable on the existing dwellings, but the flat roof dormer above the side extension, which would be built to the same height as the new roof would be considered to be out of character with the application dwellings, as well as surrounding properties and would be an alien and incongruous feature in the streetscene.

The side extensions to both houses would be three storeys high and would be built to the same height as the proposed ridge. This would result in the side extensions not being subservient to the main dwellings, and both properties would appear very dominant in the streetscape. This would be unacceptable in terms of SPD 6.

The proposed dormer would extend over the whole of the two storey extension below, which if built, would result in a three storey, flat roof, box like structure projecting around 4.5m beyond the existing rear elevation and approximately 8.5m from the proposed ridge.

Although this projection may not have a significant impact as viewed from no.61 Bishops Road, due to that property having a two storey side/rear extension, it would have a much more significant impact when viewed from no.55, which has not been extended. The three storey side elevation would be considered extremely overbearing and seriously detrimental in terms of visual amenity as viewed from no.55 next door.

Flat roof dormers are a common feature in this particular area, and there are a few examples of some which do project a short distance over extensions below. However, none appear to be as large or dominant as the proposal. In addition every proposal is assessed on its own merits, not necessarily based upon what has been built nearby. It is noted that a similar proposal was recently refused in the area due to the over dominance of the rear roof extension/dormer (ref 71919).

The proposal describes the structure as a dormer. However, looking at the proposed drawings it appears that it would be built directly up of the side and rear walls of the extensions below with no regard to the impact on the immediate neighbours. In effect this would create a three storey box shaped structure on the rear of the dwelling which would be considered to be an incongruous, alien feature which would set an unwelcome precedence in the area.

The proposed development would not be considered acceptable in this location as it would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character of the existing streetscene.

Given the above the proposal does not conform 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 -

- The distance to properties to the front of the sites would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- At the rear there would be 7m (according to the proposed site plan) from the rear of the extension to the rear site boundaries. This distance would be considered acceptable in terms of SPD 6, with regards to the proposed first floor bedroom window at no.57 Bishops Road. It is noted that there is already a first floor bedroom window, which is 7m from the rear boundary at no.59.
- As the roof extension/dormer would be built up from the rear elevation wall it too would be approximately 7m away from the rear boundary and there would be bedroom and en-suite shower room windows to both dwellings. A distance of at least 10m would be required from a dormer/second floor habitable room window to a shared boundary. As such the distance of just 7m would be considered to be sub-standard and therefore

would have a seriously detrimental impact on residential amenity at properties and private gardens to the rear.

- No.61 Bishops Road to the north has an existing two storey extension adjacent to the shared boundary with no.59 and the proposed roof extension would project around . As such the proposed roof extension would not project excessively past the rear elevation of this property and it may not result in there being a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity at this property. However, as no.55 to the south has not been extended the resulting three storey extension at no.57 would result in the extended dwelling being significantly overbearing on no.55 next door.
- It is noted that as no.55 is south of the application property, no.57 Bishops Road it is considered that there would not be any seriously detrimental impact on the path of sunlight to the rear of no.55 throughout the day.
- At the front none of the extensions would project forward of the existing front elevations and the first and second floor side extensions at both properties would be set well back from the front.
- There would be no windows to the side elevations of both dwellings.

Taking the above into account the proposal does not conform 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/site plans -

The existing and proposed site plans do not represent what is present on the two sites and as such cannot be properly assessed in relation to parking and access. Both the existing and proposed site plans note that there is a bin store directly in front of the existing side extensions with parking available to the front of the dwelling. The original driveways would have been to either side of the dwellings.

Currently there is a brick boundary wall and hedge along the front boundaries of both sites. There are original brick pillars to either side of what would have been the original drive access to the front of no.57 and there is a dropped kerb directly in front. At no.59 the original drive is open to the highway and the dropped kerb is to the front of this access point. Given the current arrangements to the front of the sites the areas noted as 'parking' on the site plans would not be accessible with a vehicle, especially at no.57 where the original pillars are still in situ.

It is noted that the existing drive lengths, as measured from the front of the existing side extensions, are both sub-standard at approximately 3.4m at no.57 and approximately 4m at no.59 (as measured from the site drawings). As such there is currently no acceptable parking available on both sites and all parking would be to the highway in front.

It is noted that there is currently insufficient on site parking available due to the existing extensions at both properties. If the properties were to be extended further as per the proposal, it would result in 9 bedrooms at no.57 and 10 at no.59, with no suitable on-site parking. Current parking standards indicate that there should be at least three parking spaces on-site parking for each property and this is clearly not possible within the current proposal.

Conclusion -

The proposed plans are conflicting and cannot be properly assessed. The proposal represents overdevelopment and is overdominant and detrimental to both visual and residential amenity. As such it is unacceptable and does not conform 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.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The design of the proposed development is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would not be subservient to the existing dwellings. As such it would be seriously detrimental to the character of the existing buildings. The proposed development therefore conflicts with 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.
- 2 The proposed development would lead to increased overlooking to the rear and would be significantly detrimental to the residential amenities and privacy of those neighbours to rear. The proposed development therefore conflicts with 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 proposed development, in terms of its height, scale, siting and design, would appear as overdominant and incongruous on the site and within the immediate locality. The proposed development is seriously detrimental to visual amenity and therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and associated Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties
- 4 The submitted plans are contradictory and contain insufficient information to enable them to be properly assessed, particularly in terms of parking and access. The application therefore is unacceptable and conflicts with the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and associated 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 -	19/02/2026	DM	19.02.2026