

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 22/01/2026

Ref:72600/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 01/12/2025

LDfC: 02/01/2026

Expiry Date: 26/01/2026

Site Visit: 13/01/2026

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: N/A

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: First floor side extension and loft conversion with front and rear dormers

Location: 3 Princess Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0LG

Description

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached house which has an existing single storey extension to the side and rear of the original dwelling. At the front of site there is a small walled front garden with a hedge along the front boundary and pedestrian access to the site only. Parking is available to the highway in front.

At the rear there is a small garden with fence to the north side boundary, brick wall to the rear and the southern boundary is currently open to the rears garden of no.5 Princess Avenue next door. The existing single storey extension projects approximately 4m to the rear and it is built directly along the shared boundary with no.5. Rear gardens to properties along Princess Avenue and Sedgley Avenue to the rear are very shallow.

The proposal is to build a first floor extension to the side which would extend an existing bedroom and add a utility room. It would measure approximately 1m wide x 3.65m long. It would be built flush with the existing rear elevation and there would be an additional window to the rear elevation to the utility room.

In addition to the first floor extension the loft would be converted to provide a shower room and 3 bedrooms, one with an en-suite shower room. There would be a small pitched roof dormer to the front and a flat roof dormer at the rear.

Relevant Planning History

67048 - Prior Approval for proposed single story rear extension - Prior Approval Required & Granted - Ext 02/07/2021

67541 - Single storey side and rear extension; Front porch - Approve with Conditions 15/11/2021

Publicity

7 neighbours notified on 08/12/2025 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

PFE Places for Everyone

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.

The main considerations of this application are the impact of the proposal on visual and residential amenity.

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.

As viewed from the rear the first floor extension would be built flush with the existing rear elevation. The roof would pitch up at the same angle as the main roof. There would be no pitch to the front of the roof which would result in an unusual design, but as the extension would be set well back from the original front elevation, in a small gap between the application dwelling and no.5 Princess Avenue to the south it would not be immediately visible in the general streetscape along Princess Avenue. It would also be finished with materials that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building.

Also to the rear, there would be a flat roof dormer extending across the whole width of the roof. The rear gardens of properties along Princess Avenue and Sedgley Avenue, to the rear are very shallow and there is approximately 10m between the original dwellings along these roads. Some of the properties have been extended to the rear and some also have rear dormers.

The rear dormer would be built with finished materials and a design that would be considered acceptable in this location and the design of the structure would be similar to other dormers in the local area.

In order to maintain the same roof height across the whole of the rear dormer it's ridge would project slightly above the ridge of the proposed first floor side extension. This would result in a small part of the dormer roof being visible over the ridge of the side extension when viewed from the front. Although a dormer projecting above a ridge line is not normally permitted, in this instance the side extension is set well back from the front of the property, in a small gap between two dwellings meaning it would not be readily visible in the public realm and as such would not cause any significant detrimental impact in terms of visual amenity in this particular location.

The front dormer would be a relatively small addition to the front of the property. The finished materials and pitched roof would be considered to be in keeping with the existing dwelling.

Given the above the proposal conforms to Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of visual amenity, and Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan listed.

Residential Amenity -

- The proposed first floor side extension would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the dwelling and the only new window would be to a non-habitable utility room.
- In terms of Planning, a distance of around 10m is usually required from a dormer on a two-storey property to a shared boundary with another dwelling. However, it is also noted that the applicant could erect a rear dormer as Permitted Development regardless of the shorter distance to the rear shared boundary. In this instance permission would only be required for the section of the dormer which would be built above the proposed first floor extension. It is considered that given that the majority of the rear dormer could be built without the need for prior planning approval the additional 1m to the side would not have any more of a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity in this area than what could be built as permitted development..
- There are other properties along Princess Avenue and Sedgley Avenue that have rear dormers of a similar design.
- There would be no new windows in the side elevation facing no.5 Princess Avenue to the south and there are no habitable room windows to the side of that property.
- The drawings show that all of the development would be within the site boundaries.
- The dormer to the front would be to an en-suite shower room. As such the separation

- distance between it and properties to the front would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- There would be no windows to the side of the dormer facing no.1 Princess Avenue, attached to the north side of the application dwelling.
- As all of the development would be to the first floor and the roof space there would be no significant detrimental effect on the external amenity space within the site.

The proposal conforms to UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of separation distance to the surrounding properties.

Parking -

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 6 and SPD6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered. This can then require the proposal to provide a maximum of 3 parking spaces. However, the site as existing does not have any on site parking available. There are not many properties in the immediate area that have on site parking. The majority of vehicles in the area would be parked on the highway and this would be the same in respect of the application site. There are no parking restrictions to the highway in front and there is public transport available close by. In this instance then the parking arrangements are considered sufficient.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. 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 001 and 002 received on 01/12/2025 and drawing numbered 003 Revision 6 received on 22/01/2026 as modified by the email from Radnor Architecture Ltd dated 22/01/2026. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to the policies of the Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of visual amenity, and Places for Everyone Joint 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.

DELEGATED REPORT

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
AU -	22/01/2026	DM	22/01/2026