

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 06/05/2026	Ref: 72946/FUL
Registration: 11/03/2026	LDfC: 10/04/2026	Expiry Date: 06/05/2026
Site Visit: 18/03/2026	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: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey side extension

Location: 20 Mountside Crescent, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 3JF

Description

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling, which is constructed from red brick and render with a tile roof. The dwelling is lower than the road and there is a sloping driveway, which accommodates 1 car. There is a front and rear garden. The land continues to slope and the rear garden is approximately, half a storey lower than the front.

There are dwellings to all boundaries. There is a bungalow to the north of the site, which is at the same level as Mountside Road and the garden is almost a storey lower.

The proposed development involves the erection of a two storey side extension and the inclusion of a covered bin store at the front of the property. The proposed extension would project between 1.6 and 2.7 metres from the side elevation.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 18 March 2026.

The neighbouring properties were notified of revised plans by means of a letter on 20 April 2026.

2 letters have been received, which have raised the following issues:

- Proposal would cause significant harm to amenity through loss of light and overshadowing.
- The upper level windows would result in direct overlooking into my property.
- The proposal would increase traffic and parking pressure on an already congested street. This raises safety concerns for residents and road users.
- Still opposed to the proposal as it will infringe upon my privacy and overshadow my property a great deal.
- The planned extension will come within 13 feet and I fully oppose the application.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None required.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

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.

SPD 6 seeks to prevent first floor side extensions from causing a terracing effect by requiring a 1.5 metre set back to the main frontage or to the boundary. The proposed extension would include a 1 metre set back from the front elevation. In this instance, the

dwelling is located next to a bungalow, which would be significantly different in style. As such, the proposed development would prevent the uncharacteristic linking up of dwellings.

The proposed two storey extension would have a hipped roof and has been reduced in size at first floor level. As such, the proposed extension would be subservient. The proposed extension is considered to be of a suitable scale and would not overwhelm the original dwelling or result in over development of the associated residential amenity space. The proposed windows and doors are considered to be suitably aligned and the use of matching materials is acceptable.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling, neighbouring properties or general streetscene and would be in accordance with Policy 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 22 metres between the proposed extension and the dwellings at the front, which would exceed the aspect standards in SPD6.
- There would be 11.7 metres from the proposed first floor extension to the rear boundary of the site, which would exceed the aspect standard of 7 metres.
- There is a habitable room window (bedroom) in the side elevation of the No. 16 Mountside Crescent. The SPD is clear that less weight is afforded to habitable room windows on the side elevation, this is the sole window to the bedroom. The agent has amended the plans to ensure that the bedroom window (No. 16) would look past and not directly face the proposed first floor extension.

Therefore, the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

Parking - SPD11 states that a 4 bedroom dwelling should provide 3 parking spaces.

The proposed site plan confirms that 1 parking space would be provided, and there was 2 parking spaces previously. Under permitted development rights, a single storey side extension could be constructed, which would reduce the parking 1 space. If required, a second parking space could be provided at the front of the dwelling and there are no restrictions to on-street parking. As such, the parking provision is considered to be acceptable in this instance. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy HT2/4 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD11.

Response to objectors

The issues raised have been addressed in the main report.

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 Location plan, S(00)01, S(00)02 Rev C, GA(00)01, GA(00)02, GA(00)03, GA(00)06 Rev A, GA(00)07 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>
HL - 06/05/2026		DM 06.05.2026	