

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 16/04/2025	Ref: 71490/FUL
Registration: 21/02/2025	LDfC: 17/03/2025	Expiry Date: 18/04/2025
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: Combining two dwellings to one, first floor extension at rear; hip to gable loft conversion; front and rear dormers and front porch.

Location: 10-12 Salisbury Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0HU

Description

The properties are a pair of storey semi-detached dwellings with a small walled gardens to the front and enclosed gardens to the rear. Properties to the front and rear are within 20m of the site. There are also subnet distance to the properties to the side of the site.

Planning permission is sought for combining two dwellings to one along with first floor extension at rear; hip to gable loft conversion, front and rear dormers and front porch.

The proposed hip to gable extension would square off the shape of the roof and increase the roof's ridge height by 0.8m, facilitating a loft conversion and dormer extensions to the front and rear. The dormer to the rear would have a flat roof and while front dormer would have a pitched.

Other proposed work include, the erection of a first floor rear extension with a pitched roof that would project 1.3m to the rear and front porch extension that would project 1.5m to the front. The proposal would also include internal alteration and facilitate a total of 8 bedrooms (no increase).The development would be constructed with some matching materials.

Relevant Planning History

01087/E - extension - Enquiry completed 04/05/2012

56534 - Part single/part two storey extensions to rear and new front porch. - Approve with Conditions 05/09/2013.

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent on 21/02/2025. 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

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.

In relation to raised in ridge height SPD 6 states that proposals to increase the height of a house can appear incongruous and will be assessed on its impact on the character on the street scene. In this instance, with an increase of 0.8m in the ridge height. Given, the pair of the semi-detached properties would have the hip to gable extension with the proposed increase in ridge height, it would lead to a more appropriate and balancing relationship among the pair of properties and the street scene.

The first-floor rear extension would not project beyond the principal side or rear elevations. Moreover, it would have a pitched to replicate the shape and style of the existing property. As such, it would be a modest structure that would appear subservient to the existing dwelling.

Front dormer are common features within this area. The front dormer would have a pitched roof, replicating the shape of the existing dwelling. Additionally, it would be a modest structure that would be setback from the ridge of the main roof.

The proposed flat roof dormer to the rear would be a modest structure that would be constructed within the footprint of the existing roof. This would be acceptable and could in fact now be built under Permitted Development rules. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6. The proposed front porch would be a modest structure with simple design that would not interfere with the current driveway or parking.

Overall, the proposed roof alterations would give the dwelling a more balanced appearance, which would be acceptable. The conversion of the properties into one single property would be acceptable as there would not be drastic changes to the exterior of the property at the front and as such no adverse impact on the character of the dwelling or the street scene.

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 and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

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

- There would be no proposed side windows and the first floor extension and the rear dormer would be located over 20m from the shared rear site boundary. The proposed front dormer would also be over 20m from the properties to the front.
- Following the application of the 45-degree rule, the first-floor extension would have no detrimental impacts on the outlook and privacy of the adjacent neighbours to the side..
- There would be an acceptable amount of private outdoor amenity space remaining and the proposed front porch would be a modest structure that would not interfere with the existing parking arrangements.

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

Highways

The proposal will result no additional bedrooms and there would be no changes to the parking layout. Therefore, the driveway at its current condition would meet the maximum parking requirements.

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 the drawings received on 07/01/2025 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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
MW	16/04/2025		