

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 24/06/2025	Ref: 71854/FUL
Registration: 30/04/2025	LDFC: 23/05/2025	Expiry Date: 25/06/2025
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: New front porch and two storey extension at side

Location: 82 Meade Hill Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M8 4LP

Description

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached house on a corner plot within a residential street of similar properties. There is a single storey extension at the rear. The attached neighbour at No.84 has an existing single storey conservatory extension at the rear and the neighbour to the rear at No.1 Northurst Drive, is as originally built.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a new front porch and two storey extension at the side. The proposed porch would project 1350mm to the front, run 2231mm to the side and would have a pitched roof. The two storey side element would project 4690mm to the side from the principal front elevation and run 7077mm to the rear. This extension would have a pitched hipped roof and the materials of the proposed development would match the existing. The proposal would accommodate a dance room on the ground floor and a principal bedroom with its own en suite bathroom and walk-in wardrobe.

Relevant Planning History

68344 - Single storey rear extension including link to garage - Approve with Conditions 11/07/2022.

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent on 02/05/2025. One representation received. See the following comment (below).

Comment

The received comment states that they have no issues with this application as long the applicant follows all the legal rules and regulations.

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 PpE 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.

SPD 6 states, to avoid the appearance of uncharacteristic terracing, the front elevation at first floor level should be set back by at least 1.5m from the main frontage of the original dwelling. The proposed two-storey side extension would have no set back from the principle front elevation on both the ground and first floors. However, there would be over 3 metres between the proposed development and the side boundary. Furthermore, the proposed extension would have a pitched hipped roof with lower ridge than the host property and the

development would be constructed using matching materials. Therefore, the proposed two storey side extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling while being in-keeping with the character of the street scene.

Situated to the front, the proposed porch would be visible from the street scene. However, the extension would be modest structure with simple design and as such, it would not detract from the character of the area and would comply with Policies H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

Residential amenity

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

- There would be sufficient distance to the rear boundary.
- The two-storey side extension would have no proposed side windows.
- The proposed two storey side extension would not project beyond the principle front and rear elevations and there would be appropriate distance to the properties to the front. Therefore, the 45 degree rule would not apply.
- The proposed single-storey rear extension would have no proposed windows on the sides and would project 2.9 metres to the rear. SPD states that a single storey extension should not project more than 3m along a neighbouring boundary. At which point the 45° rule should be applied.
- There would be sufficient distance to the rear boundary.
- The proposed front porch would be a modest structure that would not interfere with the existing parking.

Overall, there would not be any seriously negative effect on the residential amenity of any 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.

Response to comments

This is a civil matter between neighbours and as such a not a planning matter.

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.

DELEGATED REPORT

- 2 This decision relates to drawings numbered A1-201b (Rev A) 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	24/06/2025		