

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 22/12/2025	Ref: 72548/FUL
Registration: 17/11/2025	LDfC: 16/12/2025	Expiry Date: 12/01/2026
Site Visit: 27/11/2025	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 front extension

Location: 52 Woodward Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9TU

Description

The property is a two storey semi detached house located along a row of similar. It has garden to the front which has been fully hard surfaced and also provides parking.

The application proposes a single storey extension at the front 2.1m deep. It would form an entrance hall, lounge extension and wc.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Surrounding neighbours were notified by letter and no responses have been received.

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.

Visual amenity and design - The general character of the area sees similar properties and a number are extended with porches, pitched roof front bays and canopies. No.98 along the road has been extended in a similar way to the proposal.

The proposed extension would not project excessively from the front at 2.1m. It would have a hipped roof with a pitched section to the front entrance. It has been revised from the original design of a monopitch roof across the width in order to provide a more in keeping frontage. Materials are noted as traditional brick and concrete roof tiles. For the avoidance of doubt the standard matching condition is added.

The proposal is considered acceptable and in keeping with the existing property and would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Parking - The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms therefore, in relation to this, SPD 11 Parking Standards need not to be considered. The site is fully surfaced to the front and provides parking. There would be a drive length of 5.1m from the proposed extension to the front boundary which would be a sufficient length. In this instance then the parking arrangements are considered acceptable.

Residential amenity - The proposed extension would be blank wall to both sides. The unattached No.50 is separated by its drive width. The attached neighbour is No.54 and is the same layout as the site with a lounge window to the boundary side. SPD6 does not set out standards for front extensions as they should not project excessively. For rear extensions in general 3m deep is considered acceptable. In this instance the proposal would be 2.1m deep and the properties are south facing to the front.

DELEGATED REPORT

There would then be no serious impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbouring properties.

The proposal complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 - 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 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 25001-P01, 25001-P02, 25001 P03, 25001 P04 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>
JL	22/12/25	DM	22/12/25