

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Sam Summers	Date of report: 10/11/2022	Ref: 68857/GPDE
Registration: 07/09/2022	LDFC: 29/09/2022	Expiry Date: 19/10/2022
Site Visit: 08/11/2022	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 2	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: NREQ

Proposal: Prior approval for proposed single storey rear extension

Location: 34 Irwell Street, Bury, BL9 0HE

Description

A Prior Approval application for a larger home extension to a terraced brick and tile two storey dwellinghouse.

The application is for a single storey mono pitched extension off the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. It would extend beyond the original rear wall by 4.5 metres with an eaves height of 2.7 metres and an overall height of 3.7 metres.

Relevant Planning History

None

Publicity

2 objections received from neighbours -

1st objection - Overshadowing, visual amenity, noise and disturbance resulting from use, bad smells, property not suitable for 10 people.

2nd Objection - Plans unclear and inaccurate, extension extends by more than 6m from the original rear wall, extension takes up more than 50% of rear garden, extension would set a harmful precedent, overdevelopment and intensification of the use, no supporting statement, no proposed materials specified.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - None

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

Issues and Analysis

Unless a formal written objection is received from any of notified addresses as prescribed by the regulations, within the prescribed 21 days following the date of such notification prior approval will not be required as the proposed development complies with all the limitations and conditions of Part 1 Class A of the GPDO (as amended).

The dwelling is not Listed nor is it in a Conservation Area.

There is no enforcement and the proposed development would be on land wholly owned or controlled by the applicant.

Permitted Development Rights have not been removed.

The proposal would not take up more than 50% of the area of the curtilage, not including the area of the dwelling.

Council records indicate that the two storey outrigger at rear is original and therefore the proposal would not extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by more than six metres.

The proposed development would not extend beyond a wall which forms the principal or a side elevation of the original dwelling and fronts a highway.

The overall height of the proposal would not exceed four metres and the height to the eaves would not exceed three metres.

Having regard to the above the proposal would be lawful as it falls within the limitations of Part 1 Class A to Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Second Report Post Objection

Visual Amenity - The proposal would not be visible in the street scene. Its scale and massing would be acceptable. As such there would be no detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the building or adjacent and nearby occupiers than might already exist with other nearby rear extensions and outbuildings.

With regard to visual amenity the proposed development would comply with adopted UDP policy H2/3 - Extensions and SPD 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Residential Amenity -

The proposed extension would project 4.5m past the original rear elevation, 3m would be allowable under permitted development so the council should assess the impact of the additional 1.5m proposed.

The extension would project 4.5m past the rear elevation of No.36, however the extension would be North of No.36 so there would not be any issue of overshadowing. Also No.36 has an outbuilding which runs along the boundary between 36 & 34 this outbuilding would screen a part of the proposed extension. The main part that would not be screened by the existing outbuilding could be built under permitted development.

The impact on No.32 would be lessened by the proposed extension being set back from the boundary by approximately 1.95m. The extension would also have a pitched roof with the lowest part measuring 2.70m and facing No. 32. Any possible impact from the proposed extension would be significantly less than that of the original existing two storey outrigger.

Response to objections -

Overshadowing and visual amenity have been addressed in the main body of this report. The use of the property is not being changed in this application so there will be no significant changes to noise levels from the property resulting from this application. Bad smells are not a relevant consideration for an extension to a residential property. An extension to provide a wet room will not change the number of bedrooms or people able to live at the property. The plans are considered sufficient to determine the application. The extension will extend 4.5m beyond the original rear wall. The extension will not take up more than 50% of the total amenity space. Each application is considered on its own merits so there are no issues of setting a harmful precedent. There would be no intensification of the use as the use is that of a dwellinghouse and is not changing as part of this application.

DELEGATED REPORT

As for overdevelopment the property will still have amenity space at both the rear and front of the property. Supporting statements are not required as part of the application. Proposed materials will be controlled by way of an informative on the decision.

Recommendation: Prior Approval Required & Granted

Conditions and Reasons:

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
SS	10/11/2022	DM	10/11/2022