

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 14/05/2025	Ref: 71789/FUL
Registration: 28/03/2025	LDFC: 12/05/2025	Expiry Date: 23/05/2025
Site Visit: 24/04/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Front porch, single story side extension, part single part two story rear extension

Location: 75 Parkhills Road, Bury, BL9 9AR

Description

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling house located on Parkhills Road. The premises is located on a corner plot on the junction of Parkhills Road and Grosvenor Street. The dwelling has garden areas to rear and side, with a driveway located to the front of the property and accessed off Parkhills Road. The premises has been previously extended at two storey to the side.

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side/rear extension that projects approximately 2600 mm to the side and 5000mm to the rear. To the rear it is proposed to extended at two storey and single storey. The proposed single storey would project approximately 5000mm from the original rear elevation, with the two storey element projecting approximately 3600mm from the original rear elevation and sited approximately 2600mm off the shared boundary. A front porch that projects approximately 1625mm is also proposed. The plans also indicate that the existing access to the drive would be made wider by 940 mm however the existing dropped kerb from Parkhills Road would be retained as existing.

Relevant Planning History

15360 - Front porch and garage at side - Approve 12/01/1984

28161 - Two storey extension at side and detached garage at rear - Approve with Conditions 30/03/1993

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent 8/04/2025 and 17/04/2025. No representations received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - conditions requested in relation to implementation of the amendments to the existing access and storage of construction materials.

Pre-start Conditions - Agent has agreed with pre-start conditions

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
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 single storey side extension on corner plots should not normally occupy more than half the available width of the side area or should normally leave a minimum of 2 metres from the back of the highway to the side wall of the proposed extension. The proposed site plan indicates that there would be a distance of 1980mm between the side wall and the back edge of the highway. Given that there is only a deficit of 20mm this is

considered to be acceptable.

The proposed extensions would have hipped roofs replicating the shape and style of the original dwelling. The proposed windows are considered to be suitably aligned when viewed in relation to the existing window arrangement. The use of matching materials is appropriate. The proposed extensions would not overwhelm the existing dwelling or result in overdevelopment of the associated residential amenity space.

The proposed porch would not project excessively from the front elevation and would not interfere with the existing bay windows. The proposed porch is therefore considered to be acceptable. The proposal would also lead to a slight enlargement of the existing access and hardstanding to the front of the property however an element of soft landscaping would be retained to the side of the proposed hard landscaping. A condition would be proposed to ensure this hardstanding is porous/permeable. The plans do not indicate if the existing hedges would be retained, however the application form states that they would not be removed and any walls of fencing over 1m in height would require planning permission. An informative will be attached in relation to this.

It is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would not be detrimental to the character of the original dwelling or the general streetscene and would therefore comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

- No. 77 has not been extended to the rear.
- The proposed single storey rear extension would project more than 5 metres beyond the rear of No. 77. However, no objections have been received in relation to the projection of this extension. Giving consideration to the larger homes prior approval projections the 5 metre projection is therefore, considered to be acceptable.
- The proposed two storey rear extension would project more than 1 metre beyond the rear of No. 77 however it would not impact on a 45 degree line as taken from the 1 metre point on the boundary and would therefore comply with SPD 6.
- The proposed front porch would not impact on a 45 degree line as taken from the midpoint of the front bay window of No. 77.
- The proposed rear first floor windows would be located 12.8 metres from the directly facing boundary exceeding the 7 metres required by SPD 6.
- The proposed rear ground floor windows would be screened by the existing rear boundary treatment.
- No side windows proposed facing towards No. 77.
- The proposed side ground floor windows facing towards the side boundary would relate to non-habitable rooms (storage and WC) and would be separated from No. 73 by a highway in any event.
- No proposed side first floor windows facing towards No. 73.
- Proposed front and side porch windows would relate to a non-habitable room and therefore aspects have not been applied.

Parking

SPD 6 requires all new proposals to provide sufficient space to accommodate adequate parking spaces in relation to the number of bedrooms that the proposed extension would create. The proposed extensions would lead to an increase in bedrooms from 5 to 6. SPD 11 would require a maximum of 3no. spaces to be accommodated within the curtilage of the site. The amendments to the front garden, to extend the area of hardstanding would allow for 3no. cars to be accommodated to the front of the site complying with guidance.

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 Location Plan, SH2 1 of 2 Rev A and SHT 2 of 2 Rev C 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 The front boundary wall and hardstanding alterations indicated on approved plan reference IPS/R/75/BL99AR SHT 2 OF 2 Revision C, incorporating the retention of the existing footway crossing, width of widened access shown, porous/permeable driveway materials and/or measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the adopted highway, the demarcation of the limits of the adopted highway and all highway remedial works that may be required as a result of the removal of the existing boundary treatment, shall be implemented prior to occupation of the extension hereby approved.
Reason. To ensure the intervisibility of the users of the site and the adjacent highways, in the interests of road safety and to maintain the integrity of the adopted highway pursuant to Development Plan Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations.
- 4 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced unless and until facilities for the storage of construction materials have been provided within the curtilage of the site. The facilities shall be retained for the intended purpose and the area identified shall not be used for any other purposes other than the storage of construction materials for the duration of the construction period
Reason. To maintain the integrity of the adopted highway and ensure adequate off highway materials storage arrangements are provided for the duration of the construction period, in the interests of highway safety pursuant to Development Plan Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP 14/05/2025			