

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 28/01/2025	Ref: 71101/FUL
Registration: 04/12/2024	LDfC: 06/01/2025	Expiry Date: 29/01/2025
Site Visit: 14/01/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
11:00:00		
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Location: 15 Richmond Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0LZ

Description

The application property is a two storey semi-detached corner property with small garden to the front and a larger garden to the rear of the dwelling. There is an existing single storey extension to the rear. The adjacent properties on either side are No. 17 Richmond Avenue (attached) and No.1 Mather Avenue across the road.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension would project between 5m and 5.8m top the rear depending on where you measure it from. The development would accommodate an open plan kitchen/diner. The proposal would be constructed with matching materials and the extension would have a pitched roof.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent. No objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

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), 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

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

The single storey extension would be built on the rear elevation of the property and as such would not be visible from the street scene at the front. However, the proposed single storey extension would be visible from the side due to the property's corner orientation.

Nevertheless, the extension would be acceptable on this location given its modest scale and simple design. Furthermore, there are several single storey extensions with similar design and projection within the immediate street scene. It is considered that the proposal would not be intrusive feature within the street scene or to the visual amenity of the area.

The Council policy in H2/3 and SPD6 considers that development management is keen to ensure that enough private garden space is left after any extensions in order to avoid over-development of the site. Any proposals should not therefore significantly reduce the

amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree. Whilst the proposed development would reduce the private amenity space, it is considered that this space would be sufficient, and would be a suitable or usable amenity space for the property.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not lead to an insufficient amount of usable amenity space and would therefore not be detrimental to the character of the street scene and as such would comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

- In terms of overlooking and privacy, there would be no proposed side windows facing the adjacent neighbours on either side and there would be over 15m to the properties to the rear of the side.
- SPD states that a single storey extension should not project more than 3m along a neighbouring boundary. At which point the 45° rule would apply. However, taking in to account the Larger Homes Scheme and that the adjacent neighbours have not objected a projection between 5 metres and 5.8 metres along the shared boundary would be acceptable.

Overall, there would be no serious impact on amenities of the adjacent neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore conforms to UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Highways

The proposal will result in no additional bedrooms and there will be no changes to the parking layout. Therefore, the driveway at its current condition would meet 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 dwg no. BUILDING/26158192-A, dwg no. BUILDING/26158192-B, dwg no. BUILDING/26158192-C, dwg no. BUILDING/26158192-D, dwg no. BUILDING/26158192-E 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.

DELEGATED REPORT

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
MW	28/01/2025	DM	28/01/25