

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Charlotte Orrell	Date of report: 24/12/2025	Ref: 72559/FUL
Registration: 03/12/2025	LDFC: 31/12/2025	Expiry Date: 28/01/2026
Site Visit: 11/12/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Raising of roof ridge height with hip to gable roof extension and loft conversion with dormers at front and rear; Front porch; Single storey rear extension

Location: 10 Cranbrook Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0JZ

Description

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling on the north side of Cranbrook Drive. The front boundary opens onto the pavement to give both pedestrian and vehicular access. The side boundary to the west, between the application property and 12 Cranbrook Drive, is currently open however there are fence posts in place suggesting timber fencing has separated these properties previously. Timber fencing separates the boundary to the rear and the eastern side.

The proposal is to raise the ridge height of the property together with a hip to gable roof extension and loft conversion including dormers at both the front and rear. A front porch and single storey rear extension are also proposed.

The ridge height of the property would be raised by approximately 0.3m. The proposed new ridge would be formed of the ridge of the rear dormer with the existing ridge height of the existing roof of the property appearing set down from these. The proposed rear dormer would project approximately 4.7m from the rear roof plane and would be 3.5m in height and span 9m in width. The front dormer would be 2.6m in height and would project 3.9m from the front roof plane. It would be 2.7m in width.

The proposed front porch would project 1m from the existing front elevation and would be approximately 3.2m in length. It would incorporate a hipped roof to adjoin the existing bay window roof which would be 2.7m to the eaves and 3.3m to the ridge.

The proposed rear extension would project a maximum of 4.5m from the existing rear elevation of the property. It would be 9.1m in length, spanning the width of the property and would incorporate a flat roof with a roof lantern; a maximum of 3.6m in height.

The streetscape is generally mixed in nature, predominantly of semi-detached properties of a mock tudor design with red brick and render as materials. The area is characterised by properties featuring a range of extensions.

Parking is generally on street within the area however some properties do have small driveways for 1 or 2 vehicles.

Relevant Planning History

60150 - Two storey side extension - Withdrawn - Invalid 04/08/2016

60921 - Two storey side extension - Approve with Conditions 09/01/2017

71773 - Hip to gable roof extension with loft conversion and dormers at front and rear; Front porch; Single storey rear extension - Approve with Conditions 07/08/2025

11/0310 - Hut at side - 12/07/2011

Publicity

5 neighbouring properties were consulted on 05/12. No comments have been received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - None

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PfE	Places for Everyone
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury

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 states that dormers should be set down 0.5m from the main ridge line of the existing roof. The proposal seeks to raise the ridge height of the property by constructing the rear dormer as 0.3m higher than the existing roof. This would therefore mean that the ridge of the dormer would be higher than that of the existing ridge line which would therefore not be considered acceptable.

The raising of the ridge height would also physically and visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings, exacerbated by the difference in ground level along Cranbrook Drive. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer being higher than the existing ridge would therefore be visible from the street scene and would appear as an inconsistent addition.

The proposed front dormer would be set in 0.5m from the party wall with no 8 Cranbrook Drive and would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 1.1m. Furthermore, it would also not occupy a disproportionately large part of the roof and therefore would comply with that outlined within SPD 6.

The proposed single storey extension would be located at the rear and would have a flat roof. Whilst a flat roof would not normally be considered acceptable, the proposed development would be screened from public views and would not be dissimilar to other extensions, including those built under permitted development, in the vicinity of the site. As such, the proposed extension would be acceptable in design terms.

The proposed front porch would project only 1m from the existing front elevation and would incorporate a hipped roof to match the existing bay window at the property. Given this, the proposed is considered to appear as a consistent and subordinate addition.

The materials proposed are to match the existing which is therefore also considered acceptable. Storage for bins would also not be impacted.

Given the above, the proposed rear dormer and consequently the raising of the ridge height of the property would not be considered acceptable and would be contrary to the guidance within 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.

In terms of 12 Cranbrook Drive, the proposed single storey rear extension would project 4.5 metres from the rear elevation of the dwelling, which would result in 10 metre projection adjacent to No. 12 Cranbrook Drive. There is a single door and small window on the rear elevation, which relate to a garage at 12 Cranbrook Drive. As this is not a habitable room,

DELEGATED REPORT

there would be no adverse impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent property.

The proposed extension would project 5.3 metres past the rear elevation of No. 12 Cranbrook Drive (which contains a habitable room window) and 6 metres past the rear elevation of No. 8 Cranbrook Drive. However, no objections have been received in relation to the projection of this extension. Giving consideration to the larger homes prior approval extension, which allows extensions of up to 6 metres where there are no objections, the proposed 5.3 metre and 6 metre projection is considered to be acceptable.

There would be 10 metres from the rear of the proposed rear dormer to the garden boundary, which would comply with the aspect standards in SPD6.

The proposed front dormer and front porch would be 19m away from properties to the front compliant with the aspect standards within SPD6.

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-

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 7 and SPD 6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered.

The dwelling is sited within Zone 4 and therefore the parking standards for properties with more than 4 bedrooms is 3 car parking spaces. As the parking provision at the property would not change, and the parking standards at the property do not change under the proposal, this would therefore be considered acceptable.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed rear dormer and raising of the roof height would, by reason of its design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD 6.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
CO - 19/12/2025		HL 24/12/25	