

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 10/10/2023	Ref: 70006/FUL
Registration: 22/08/2023	LDFC: 22/09/2023	Expiry Date: 17/10/2023
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey extension at side, single storey extension at side/rear, porch/canopy at front

Location: 57 Plymouth Grove, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 3WU

Description

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached house on 57 Plymouth Grove, a residential road with similar style properties. The property has a drive to the front, a garage to the side and garden to the rear. The adjacent properties on either side are No. 55 and No. 59 (attached). To the rear the site shares boundary with No.32 Ashcombe Drive while No.223 Turks Road is the dwelling in front of the site.

Planning permission is sought for single side/rear extension, two storey side extension and a single storey front extension. The single storey side/rear extension would project 1.5 metres to the rear following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The two-storey side element would project approximately 2.5 metres to the side, while the front porch extension would extend project 0.9 metres to the front.

The proposal would facilitate a larger open plan kitchen/diner, a new toilet and a new entrance on the ground floor level. On the first floor, the proposal would accommodate an additional bedroom and a larger bathroom. The development would utilise the use of matching materials and would have a pitched roof above all extensions.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent. No objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

Unitary 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) and 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 Policy 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

UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to achieve a high standard of design that complements the original building, does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of neighbouring properties, and protects the general street scene.

The proposed single storey side/rear extension would be simple and unobtrusive design that would not detract from the character of the dwelling. With a projection of 1.5m to the rear, it would be considered modest in scale.

The SPD 6 states, to avoid the appearance of uncharacteristic terracing, the front elevation at first floor level should be set back by at least 1.5 metres from the main frontage of the original dwelling. The proposed extension would not have a setback. However, in this instance due to a staggered building line together with the fact that the site is located on a bend, as such it would therefore be generally acceptable within this location. Moreover, the

proposed development would not project beyond the principal front and rear elevations.

To the front, the property would be significantly set back from the immediate neighbour. Additionally, this development would be simple, rectangular, and modest in scale with a projection of only 0.9m to the front. Therefore, there would be sufficient mitigation to suggest that the front extension proposed could sit within the streetscape relatively comfortably without interfering with suitable on-site parking.

Overall, in terms of scale, design and setting, along with the use of matching materials, the development would not overwhelm the existing dwelling or result in over development of the associated amenity space. Therefore, the proposed extension would therefore comply with SPD 6.

It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling, street scene or neighbouring properties and would therefore comply with UDP Policy H2/3.

Residential amenity

UDP policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

- In terms of overlooking and privacy to the rear, there would be over 10 metres from the first-floor windows to the shared rear boundary. This would be acceptable as it meets SPD6 guidelines. Additionally, this window would be from a non-habitable bedroom and the existing high scrubs would further shade the proposed development from the neighbours to the rear.
- On the ground floor level, the proposed windows to the rear would be over 8 metres from the shared rear boundary. Furthermore, the existing high shrubs/ plants and high fencing beyond would further shade the proposed extension.
- SPD states that a single storey extension should not project more than 3m along a neighbouring boundary, at which point the 45° rule would be applied. The proposed part single-storey rear element would have no proposed windows on either side and would project less than 3 metres to the rear.

The proposed extension would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Parking

The proposal will result in one additional bedroom, however there will be no changes to site access, or parking. The driveway at its current condition meets the maximum parking requirements.

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 PG 01A 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 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>
MW	10/10/2023	DM	16/10/23