

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 01/06/2026

Ref:73112/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 22/04/2026

LDfC: 01/06/2026

Expiry Date: 17/06/2026

Site Visit: 21/05/2026

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: Single storey extension at side/rear

Location: 24 Cambridge Grove, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 6DB

Description

The application relates to a two-storey end of terrace house in a short row of four homes. The property is owned by the Local Authority and the application has been submitted with regards to the construction of a ground floor bedroom and bathroom for a disabled member of the household.

The single storey extension would be built on the north side elevation. It would measure 2759mm wide at the front and it would be set back from the front elevation by around 2000mm. It would measure 6872mm long and at the rear it would project 2000mm beyond the rear elevation and would be 3250mm wide. It would have a hipped roof, windows to the front and rear elevations, and an entrance door to the side. The extension would be accessed internally via the existing kitchen.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

7 neighbours were notified on 07/05/2026 - 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.

The site is set well back from the highway in a small cul-de-sac. As the extension would be built approximately 2000mm back from the existing front elevation it would not be openly visible in the streetscape. In addition it would be built with materials and a design that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building.

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 -

- As the extension would be set back from the existing front elevation of the dwelling it would not interfere with any existing or future parking to the front of the site.
- The proposed bathroom window to the front would be obscurely glazed to retain privacy levels between users of the room and neighbouring sites.
- The only opening to the side elevation would be a door. This would face on to the boundary fence and any views from the door would be over the applicant's own garden and not directly towards the neighbouring dwelling.
- There would be more than sufficient garden space remaining around the extension and the distance to the rear boundary would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- The rear of the extension would be an acceptable distance away from the shared boundary with no.22 next door and there would be no windows facing this boundary.
- The drawings show that all of the development would be within the residential curtilage of 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 by 1, and SPD6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered. As the first floor of the property has not been surveyed by the agent it is not clear whether the total number of bedrooms would be 3 or 4. However, although it would appear the a vehicle has been parked on the grass at the front of the dwelling, technically the site does not have any on site parking. This would not change following the construction of the single storey extension. The extension would be for use by a disabled person in the household which would outweigh any parking concerns at this particular site. In this instance then the existing parking arrangements are considered sufficient.

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 drawings numbered 01, 02, 03, 04 and 05 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 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

DELEGATED REPORT

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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
AU - 01/06/2026		DM 02.06.2026	