

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 25/09/2026	Ref: 73466/FUL
Registration: 22/07/2026	LDFC: 18/08/2026	Expiry Date: 16/09/2026
Site Visit: 07/08/2026	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: Single storey side and rear extension

Location: 1 Greenpark Close, Tottington, Bury, BL8 4QB

Description

The application relates to a detached two storey dwelling which is positioned on a corner plot within a residential estate.

The dwelling has a generous side garden approximately 8.6m wide and the rear garden extends 25.7m to the rear boundary. There is an ancillary outbuilding and attached former garage located next to the rear boundary.

The application seeks a single storey side and rear extension.

The proposed side extension would be set back approximately 2m from the existing front elevation and project 2.7m to the side and extend rearwards by 12.7m. It would thereon extend across the back of the property by 9.16m. Adjacent to the boundary with No 3, the proposed extension would project 6m from the existing rear wall. The extension would have a pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.7m and would be 2.4m to the eaves.

The proposed extension would provide a hall, bedroom and kitchen/diner.

Materials would comprise part timber cladding and glazing with the elevations in an off-white render.

Relevant Planning History

n/a

Publicity

Letters sent to 3 properties on 27/7/26.

No responses received

Revised plans received to reduce the footprint of the proposed extension and change the flat roof to a pitched roof.

1 neighbour notified on 4/9/26

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

n/a

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design

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.

Size, position and design

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.

SPD6 states that single storey extensions on corner plots should not occupy more than half of the available width of the site area or should normally leave a distance of 2m from the back of the public highway to the side wall of the proposed extension.

A lesser set back may be acceptable where the prevailing pattern of development in the locality is typified by relatively shallow frontages.

The prevailing pattern of the dwellings within this housing estate is one where the dwellings are set back from the road frontage and there is a sense of openness and space within the estate.

The side boundary of the site to Hunt Fold Drive is irregular in shape and from the front elevation of the proposed side extension to the side boundary there would be a distance of 5.2m and a minimum a distance of at least 2m would be retained from the side extension to the side boundary with Hunt Fold Drive.

As such the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and layout of the housing estate and within the street scene and would align with SPD6.

The proposed footprint of the extension has been reduced from the original submission and would not dominate the host building.

The proposed extension would have a pitched roof which would be in keeping with the existing property and the character of the housing estate and as such the design would be acceptable.

Materials would be rendered walls and the front elevation would comprise a new entrance door, glazing above which would timber cladding.

Whilst the surrounding houses are largely brick built, the property opposite is fully rendered and there are examples within the state with rendered feature wall.

As such the proposal is considered acceptable within the street scene and would comply with H2/3 and SPD6.

Residential amenity

SPD6 states that single storey rear extensions should not normally project more than 3m along the boundary of a neighbour and those which do should not encroach the 45 degree line when taken from the nearest habitable room window of that neighbour.

The extension would project 6.8m past the rear boundary with the adjacent dwelling, No.3 and would encroach the 45 degree line. However, the extension would be located north of the neighbour and as such any overshadowing of the neighbours property would be limited. The extension would have a pitched roof which would slope away from the neighbours house and garden.

In addition, the GPDO 2015 Part 1 Class A (as amended) allows for larger home extensions which in the case for a single storey extension to a detached property could project 8m beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse to a height of 4m.

It is noted that no representations have been received to the proposed development.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not have a significantly harmful impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent property.

The proposal would comply with H2/3 and SPD6.

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 -

Location plan TDS-25-196-00 rev A
Existing site plan TDS-24-196-01 rev A
Existing plans and elevations TDS-25-196-02
Proposed site plan TDS-24-196-03 rev A
Proposed plans and elevations TDS-25-196-04 rev A

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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details on the approved plans.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 and H2/3.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT	25/9/26	DM	25/9/26