

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Tom Beirne	Date of report: 22/10/2025	Ref: 72339/FUL
Registration: 01/09/2025	LDfC: 09/10/2025	Expiry Date: 27/10/2025
Site Visit: 21/10/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey extensions at front, side and rear including raising roof height to form accommodation in loft space

Location: 108 Windsor Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0DF

Description

The application follows a recent refusal of planning permission for extensions and relates to a two storey detached house close to the junction with Mead Hill Road. There is a flat roof garage attached at the side and driveway to the front and conservatory at the rear. The immediate area is characterised by similar styled residential properties with hipped roofs. The neighbour (No.110), immediately to the north, has a single storey extension at the rear with a kitchen window facing towards the shared side boundary. The same neighbour also has a first floor bathroom and landing windows and an obscure glazed side window (lounge). The neighbour to the south has had a small single storey and first floor side extensions (see site photos).

As with the previous application, the revised proposal involves a significant amount of demolition, with the front, north side (garage) and rear walls being removed, along with the roof.

- The new front elevation would extend out just over 1m to the forwardmost point of the existing bay and run across the front elevation 11.7m, incorporating the side extension.
- The two storey side extension would project out 3.1m and run 11.5m from front to rear.
- The existing conservatory at the rear would be demolished. The extension would 'wrap-around' the rear, projecting out 3.5m from the original rear elevation with the 'side extension' element set back 1.2m.
- The new roof would have a similar eaves height to the existing but would have a ridge height raised 700mm to 7.9m, from a previous height of 7.2m. The new roof would have been revised from the refused application to indicate a shallower hipped roof with two smaller gables on the front elevation. The roofspace would accommodate additional living accommodation.
- The front elevation would be rendered with the sides and rear finished in red brick.

Relevant Planning History

71940 - Two storey extensions at front, side and rear including raising roof height to form accommodation in loft space - Refused 05/08/2025 on grounds that proposal would, by reason of its size and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area.

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 17/09/2025. One objection from neighbours summarised below:

- This is a duplicate of the planning request which has already been refused. No changes have been made at all to the plans for this overbearingly huge wraparound extension with roof lift.

- If this was to be approved it would have a significant impact on the lives of the people living at 110 the privacy to 110 with the garden, garden room, kitchen even bathroom being dominated by this proposed extension.
- The loss of daylight to the bathroom, living room and kitchen would be detrimental to day to living due to the overshadowing of the proposed extension. It would make 110 incredibly dark and depressing. 110 relies totally on the daylight coming in at the side of the house both upstairs and downstairs otherwise the house would be extremely dark.
- If this huge extension and roof lift were to be allowed it would be an infringement of privacy, personal space and the feeling of safety and privacy.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None relevant.

Pre-start Conditions - N/A

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
H2/3 Extensions and Alterations
EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design

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 - The previous scheme had a more dominant roof with a higher pitch and larger gables. It was considered that this in particular would have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of the site and immediate surroundings. With the steep pitch to the roof planes, the house would appear as particularly overdominant and rather incongruous within the immediate streetscape.

The revised scheme, although with a similar footprint, would be a significant improvement over the previous scheme with a less dominant roof style. The gables would sit down from the ridge and the pitch would be slightly less steep.

In terms of visual amenity and streetscape, the revised proposal is now considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 Extensions and Alterations and associated guidance in SPD6.

Residential amenity - Although positioned directly to the south of the neighbour at No.110, the larger building structure would not have a significantly detrimental impact over and above the existing house visually and in terms of overshadowing to warrant refusal. The property at No.110 has been extended to the rear and has a side kitchen window facing across the shared side boundary towards what would be the side wall of the new extension. The outlook from this window would clearly be impacted however it is a side window in an extension and therefore cannot be afforded a great deal of weight in any planning assessment. The other windows in the side of this property are either non-habitable or secondary and, again, cannot be given significant weight in any assessment. All windows in the new north elevation would be required to be obscure glazed to reduce overlooking.

On the rear of No.108, the nearest windows to the shared boundary with No.110 would be none habitable utility and WC windows that could be obscure glazed, there are no serious overlooking issues despite the boundary between the two properties running at an angle. Indeed any views from the new windows would be more acute than the existing windows.

With regard to the neighbour at No.35 Meade Hill Road, the impact of the rear extension would be greater with the two storey extension projecting out approximately 3.6m along the shared side boundary which runs at an angle to No.35 Meade Hill. There are however mitigating factors that lessen its impact. The extension would be to the north of No.35 Meade Hill thereby limiting overshadowing. Also, the nearest window in the rear elevation of No.35 is a kitchen at ground floor. Whilst it would be preferable if the extension were to be pulled away from or reduce in size on this side, it is not considered that the impact would be so serious as to warrant refusal of planning permission.

In terms of residential amenity, the proposal does not have a seriously detrimental impact and would, on balance, comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance in SPD6.

Parking and Access - No changes are proposed to the existing access. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of UDP Policy H2/3 and guidance with regard to access and

parking.

Public comments - The daylighting and privacy issues raised by the neighbour have been addressed in the residential amenity section above.

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 Location plan, Site plans and streetscape and drawings numbered NA-P01, P02, P03 and P04 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.
- 3 Details of the render/bricks to be used in the external elevations, together with details of their manufacturer, type/colour and size, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced. Only the approved materials shall be used for the construction of the development.
Reason. No details have been submitted and are required in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to UDP Policy H2/3 Extensions and alterations.
- 4 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted all ground and first floor windows on the north side elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing (Min obscurity level 3) and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
Reason. To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers and to accord with Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

<u>Case Officer</u> Tom Beirne	<u>Date</u> 22/10/2025	<u>Sign off Officer</u> HL - 23/10/2025	<u>Date</u>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------	--	-------------