

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 18/09/2026

Ref:73395/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 10/07/2026

LDfC: 01/08/2026

Expiry Date: 04/09/2026

Site Visit: 06/08/2026

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 4

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: N/A

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey extension at side; First floor extension at rear; Removal of existing porch and formation of new entrance

Location: 32 Newlands Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 3BU

Description

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached house located at the head of a cul-de-sac. At the front there is a small garden area with a short brick wall along part of the front boundary. There is a drive to the front of the site for one vehicle. This is open to the highway in front.

The area to the side of the property is paved and there are two detached sheds along the southwest site boundary. There is a single storey rear extension and to the side of that and the original side elevation is a lean-to extension at the side of the existing dwelling which is partly an external store and part store room, accessed from the kitchen. The main garden are is to the rear (east) of the dwelling and there is an area of decking.

The proposal is to build a single storey side extension, a first floor rear extension and the removal of the existing porch and formation of a new front entrance. At the side the single storey extension would measure approximately 2.85m wide and 9.4m long. The front elevation would be built flush with the existing front elevation and it would have a flat roof. There would be a wc window and utility room door at ground floor level to the side elevation.

The proposed first floor extension would be built above the existing single storey rear extension. It would measure approximately 3.6m x 4.3m and it would have a pitched roof. It would be used as a bedroom and an existing bedroom would be removed and new en-suite bathroom installed. The existing bathroom window would remain in situ and the stairwell window would be repositioned at a higher level, similar to the bathroom window. On the rear elevation the existing patio doors to the living room would remain as there are and there would be a new set of patio doors for entry into the new kitchen/dining area, and there would be a kitchen window adjacent. At first floor level there would be a bedroom window overlooking the rear garden.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

7 neighbours notified on 10/07/2026 - 4 objections received. A summary of the objections is shown below.

- concerns about water drainage and flood risk to properties on Sunningdale Drive
- proximity to property line and neighbouring properties

DELEGATED REPORT

- reduction in outlook and loss of light
- overbearing impact; site in elevated position compared to neighbouring properties
- increased overlooking and loss of privacy
- the cumulative impact of all these issues, over dominant
- Inadequate plans - do not convey the relationship with neighbouring properties
- Overshadowing and dominance by virtue of separation distances, height, depth
- Mass, location of a building/extension and window positions.
- Trees within falling distance of the site, not mentioned on application form
- The submitted plans don't provide sufficient information about neighbouring windows
- Overlooking of principle living space of neighbours gardens on Sunningdale Drive
- The plans also fail to adequately demonstrate the increased elevation of Newlands Drive in relation to the neighbouring properties on Sunningdale Drive. As a result, the impact of the proposal on nearby residents cannot be properly understood or assessed from the submitted information alone
- Furthermore, it is not possible from the material provided to accurately assess distances between the proposed extension and neighbouring properties, or to evaluate the likely effects on daylight, outlook and privacy

4 neighbours notified of revised drawings on 07/09/2026 - 3 objections received. A summary of the objections is below.

- They appreciate that the first floor element has been reduced in size, but it still projects around 1m to the side and there are still concerns about detrimental impact on light to their kitchen/dining room which is their main living space
- The revisions address some of their initial objections, but they still have concerns regards flooding
- Given the difference in land levels the structure may have a detrimental impact on light to their property
- The ground floor extension is still very large and would be a substantial structure close to the shared boundary
- Overbearing structure
- The proposed kitchen window appears that it could overlook neighbouring properties
- Still a risk of flooding as the site is approximately 2.5 feet higher than the neighbouring properties on Sunningdale Drive
- The combination of a very large flat roof ground floor extension and smaller off-set first floor extension would create an unusual and bulky appearance
- The ground floor section would still be very close to the shared boundary and it would be an oppressive structure
- size, scale and dominance of the structure
- The single storey extension would be within 2m of the boundary and would exceed the maximum 3m height limit permitted under these conditions
- Impact on privacy

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
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.

It is noted that the applicant could build a single storey side extension of a similar design under Permitted Development rules with either a pitched or flat roof, and given the size of the site it could be possible to build a much wider side extension, as long as it would be

single storey. Taking this into account the flat roof design of the single storey side extension would be considered acceptable in this location.

The first floor element would have a pitched roof which would reflect the existing roof on the dwelling. The proposed finished materials would also be considered to be in keeping with the existing building.

The site is around 750mm higher compared to properties on Sunningdale Drive to the south of the site. There are some small shrubs/bushes along the southern boundary, but in general this boundary with properties on Sunningdale Drive is fairly open and the extensions would be openly visible from the rear of these properties. However, although the single storey extension would be partially visible from the neighbouring properties its distance from the rear of the properties Sunningdale Drive would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6 and it has been noted that the single storey extension would have a Permitted Development fall back.

Although there may be some indirect views of the proposed extension to the north and south, peripheral views are not a consideration in terms of assessing the planning application. The proposed development would comply with the separation distances, which is a consideration when assessing if the extension would be overbearing.

As the extensions would be more than 2m away from the south boundary it is considered that the first floor extension would not be significantly overbearing enough to warrant refusal of the proposal on the grounds of its impact on visual amenity.

Given the above the proposal conforms 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 -

- At the front the extension would be built flush with the existing front elevation of the main dwelling. As such it would not have any seriously detrimental impact on the existing drive to the front of the site. The existing space measuring approximately 5.8m would remain.
- At the rear there would be approximately 13m from the proposed first floor bedroom window to the rear site boundary.
- Currently there is a single storey extension at the rear with no windows in the north elevation facing the boundary with the attached neighbour. There would be two new ground floor windows installed in this elevation to the proposed kitchen/dining room. As this elevation would not be any closer to the shared boundary with no.23 Newlands Drive and any views from the new windows would be towards the existing boundary fence there would not be any seriously detrimental impact on privacy levels at the attached property.
- The first floor extension would be approximately 3m away from the shared boundary with no.23 and the 45° rule would be satisfied with regards to the ground floor patio doors on the rear of no.23, closest to the shared boundary.
- Although there may be some indirect views to the north and south of site peripheral views are not a consideration in terms of assessing the planning application. The first floor bedroom window to the rear and all ground floor windows on the rear elevation would have direct views over the applicant's own garden only.
- The south elevation would be approximately 2.8m from the southern boundary, at its shortest point. This would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- No.15 Sunningdale Drive to the south does not share a boundary with the site, but the extension would be visible from the rear of this dwelling. There would be approximately 13.5m from the rear elevation of no.15 Sunningdale Drive to the side of the single storey side extension. This distance would be acceptable as set out in SPD 6.
- The first floor extension would not directly face no.15 Sunningdale Drive.
- On the side elevation there would be a new wc window, which would be obscurely

glazed and an external door to a utility room. As these rooms would be considered to be non-habitable rooms and the bathroom would be obscurely glazed their position on the side elevation would be considered acceptable.

- Similarly, at first floor level the existing stairwell window would be repositioned at a higher level (same as the existing bathroom). As a stairwell/landing would be classed as being non-habitable and the window would be approximately 9m from the southern boundary its position would be considered acceptable in terms of SPD 6 and would not have any seriously detrimental effect on residential amenity at properties to the south of the site.
- There would be approximately 12m from the side elevation of the single storey extension to the rear of no.17 Sunningdale Drive and at least 13m from the first floor extension. As these distances would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6 it would be considered that the extensions would not cause any significant harm in terms of residential amenity at the rear of the neighbouring property, and garden.
- No.19 Sunningdale Drive has a two storey rear extension, which is within 7m of the rear boundary, and this extension would be approximately 7m away from the rear corner of the proposed first floor extension. It is noted that the separation distance from the rear of the extension to the property to the rear corner of the proposed extension is less than recommended in SPD 6. However, SPD6 states that the separation between aspects of dwellings and new dwellings is an important consideration in maintaining adequate privacy distances and avoiding overbearing relationships. For clarity, measurements are taken from the windows of the original neighbouring dwelling and not extensions. The proposed development would comply with the aspect standards when measured to the original rear wall of the neighbouring dwelling.
- Any direct views from windows on the rear of no.19 Sunningdale Drive would look past the rear corner of the proposed first floor extension and not directly towards the side or rear elevation, and there would be no windows in the extension that would directly overlook this particular property.
- The distance from the rear of the extensions to the shared boundary with no.21 Sunningdale Drive would be acceptable as per SPD 6.
- The site is approximately 2.5 feet (approximately 762mm) higher than properties on Sunningdale Drive, directly south of the site. As such it wouldn't warrant the additional separation distance that would be required had the site been significantly higher.
- As the site is positioned north of properties on Sunningdale Drive there would not be any significantly detrimental impact on the path of sunlight throughout the day.
- As there would be no habitable room windows installed to the side elevation there would not be any significant detrimental impact on privacy levels at properties to the south of the site

The proposal conforms 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 -

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms therefore SPD 11 Parking Standards need not be considered. The parking arrangements would remain as existing where there is parking to the existing drive at the front of the site.

Response to neighbour objections -

- Concerns have been raised by the objectors in relation to surface water flooding. It is considered that the site would have sufficient amenity space remaining around the development so that any additional surface water would drain in to the land within the site. In addition drainage would be considered as part of the Building Regulations application and would be inspected accordingly to ensure that the drainage system installed would be sufficient.
- One objection stated that the plans do not convey the relationship between the site and properties on Sunningdale Drive and do not provide sufficient information about neighbouring windows. There is no requirement in law for proposed drawings to include

the neighbouring properties. However, a site visit was undertaken and photographs were taken of neighbouring properties, and the windows on the rear of those properties were considered when assessing the application.

- There are trees within falling distance of the site, which have not been noted on the application. This may be so, but any trees, other buildings and such were noted when the site visit was done. The impact upon these trees/buildings have been assessed as part of the application.
- There are concerns that the proposed extension would be within 2m of the shared boundary with properties to the south of site. The proposed drawings show that there would be at least 2m from the closest point of the proposed extension to the south boundary. This would be inline with expectations as set out in SPD 6.
- There is a reference to the proposed single storey extension exceeding 3m height when it would be within 2m of the boundary. The height of the single storey extension would exceed 3m but it wouldn't be within 2m of the boundary.

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 numbered 02001-S2-P2, 03104-S2-P1 and 04001-S2-P2 received on 03/07/2026, drawings numbered 01001-S2-P2 and 01101-S2-P2 received on 10/07/2026 and drawings numbered 01102-S2-P3, 02101-S2-P4, 02102-S2-P3, 02103-S2-P2, 03101-S2-P3, 03102-S2-P3 and 03103-S2-P4 received on 07/09/2026 as modified by the email from Home Architecture Studio dated 07/09/2026. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details 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>
AU - 18/09/2026		DM 18/09/2026	

