

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 01/09/2026

Ref:73362/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 25/06/2026

LDfC: 20/07/2026

Expiry Date: 20/08/2026

Site Visit: 14/07/2026

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: NONE

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Two storey side and rear extension with juliette balcony; Single storey front extension; Hip to gable loft conversion with raised ridge rear dormer; Decking to rear with balustrade balcony

Location: 9 Silverdale Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0FD

Description

The application relates to a two-storey detached house with gardens to the front and rear of the dwelling. The building has a hipped roof with a cat slide to part of the roof to the front. The dwelling is slightly raised compared to the highway in front with a brick wall and planting along the front boundary. There is a drive for one vehicle at the front as well. At the rear there is a private garden with fences to the boundaries and to the east boundary the side elevation of the garage at no.11 is built right up to the shared boundary. There is a patio area, a children's play area to the rear and most of the garden is astro turf.

The proposal is to build a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey front extension hip to gable roof extension with ridge height increase a flat roof rear dormer. There would also be decking to the rear with a glazed balustrade, and new steps leading down to the garden.

At the front of the dwelling there would be a single storey extension projecting approximately 631mm forward of the existing front elevation and measuring approximately 5.37m wide. The extension would provide a new porch to the front with office to the side and the roof would be pitched. As the house is higher compared to the land in front there would be new steps leading from the drive up to the front door.

Along the side the single/two-storey extension would project approximately 2.8m wide with an overall length of 13.77m. The first floor at the front would be set back from the most forward elevation by approximately 800mm and it would measure 9.11m long. To the rear of the two-storey side extension would be a flat roof section with a Succah roof.

The extension would project 5m out from the rear elevation and it would measure approximately 9.62m wide, and at the rear the two-storey element would measure 5.75m wide.

The roof height would be increased by approximately 1m and it would be pitched with three rooflights to the front and a flat roof dormer to the rear. There would be two new first floor bathroom windows to the east side elevation and a landing window to the west side. On the rear elevation there would be a Juliet balcony installed at first floor level and an en-suite shower room window.

The loft would be converted into two bedrooms and two en-suite shower rooms.

As the dwelling has a higher ground level compared to the rear garden there would be a new area of raised decking constructed across the rear of the house. It would project approximately 2.8m and would measure 9m wide with steps leading to the rear garden. It would be constructed from timber with a glazed balustrade.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

7 neighbours notified on 29/06/2026 - 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.

SPD 6 states that where a two-storey or first floor extension would be adjacent to a shared boundary there should be a first floor set back of 1.5m from the original front elevation. This would be to prevent terracing of properties which are not designed as terraced homes. The proposed drawing shows that there would be a first floor set back at the front of approximately 800mm and the extension would be built directly along the shared boundary with no.7 next door. There is a path to the side of no.7 measuring approximately 800mm and this area is unlikely to be built on in the future, so the gap would be retained. In addition the proposed development including the pitched roof would be a totally different style/design compared to no.7 next door. Taking this into account there would be no concerns regarding terracing of these two properties in the future.

Whilst it could be possible for the applicant to convert the existing hipped roof to a gable without the need for planning permission, the increased ridge height would require permission and it is that which needs to be assessed.

The proposal includes the raising of the existing ridge height by approximately 1m. The existing ridge is a similar height to the roof at no.7 and approximately 900mm/1m higher than no.11 to the east. If it is increased the ridge would be approximately 1m higher than the ridge at no.7 and approximately 2.1m higher than no.11. This would result in the building appearing unusually tall, and large compared to others along Silverdale Avenue, where the height of most properties decrease from west to east due to the way the land falls. The resulting building would be an over bearing, incongruous feature in the existing streetscape and therefore would be considered to be significantly detrimental in terms of visual amenity in this location.

Given the above the proposal does not conform 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 -

- The distances to properties at the front and rear of the site would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- At the front the remaining drive length would be approximately 5.6m and to the rear there would be approximately 9m from the rear elevation to the rear boundary. These

distances would be acceptable in terms of SPD 6.

- The single storey extension to the front southwest corner of the house would project around 1m forward of the front elevation of no.7 next door and there would be a gap of around 800mm at the side of no.7, from the extension to the side of this property. The single storey front extension would not have any seriously detrimental effect on the ground floor habitable room window at the front of no.7 Silverdale Avenue.
- The first floor would be set back from the front of no.7 and there would be three windows in the side elevation, two to a stairwell and one to a ground floor wc. As these windows are directly adjacent to the shared boundary a condition would be added to the decision stating that they should be obscurely glazed and remain so at all times in the future. This would be to maintain privacy levels between the two properties.
- On the opposite elevation there would be two new first floor bathroom windows which would also be conditioned to be obscurely glazed to retain privacy levels.
- The two-storey rear extension would be no closer to the shared boundary with no.11 next door than the existing building. No.11 is also a two-storey property. The existing gap between the two properties would remain and the extension would be adjacent to a driveway at that property, and not directly adjacent to any habitable room windows or the useable garden area. As such the position of the two-storey rear extension would be considered acceptable in the proposed location.
- At the rear the extension would project beyond the rear elevation of no.7 by approximately 5m. As the next door neighbour has not objected to the proposal the projection of 5m at ground floor level would be considered acceptable in terms of the Larger Homes Scheme. It would be the impact of the proposed first floor level, on this property which needs to be assessed.
- The two-storey element to the rear would project beyond the rear of no.7 by approximately 1.8m, and there is an original ground floor (possibly habitable) window closest to the shared boundary at the rear of no.7. SPD 6 states that normally where there are no extensions at a neighbouring property a projection of 1m at first floor level would be considered acceptable in terms of the impact on residential amenity at the neighbouring property. The proposed two-storey extension would project around 800mm more than what is recommended in SPD 6, but this is a recommendation and on occasion a greater projection may be acceptable. In this instance there is an existing gap of approximately 800mm from the side elevation of no.7 and the shared boundary. This area would be highly unlikely to be developed and as such the agent has taken this gap into consideration and proposed a 1.8m projection past the rear of no.7.
- The site is positioned to the east of no.7, meaning that the existing dwelling would have some detrimental impact on the path of the sun during the first half of the day. The proposed two-storey rear extension may have some detrimental impact on light to the rear of no.7 in the early hours of the day, but for the remainder of the day it is considered that it would not have any more of an impact on light to the property at no.7 Silverdale Avenue than the existing building does now.
- Given the site is due east of no.7 the proposed extension would not have any significant detrimental effect on light to the rear of no.7 in the second half of the day and evening.
- The rear dormer would be a sufficient distance from the rear site boundary not to have any seriously detrimental effect on residential amenity at properties to the rear.
- The decking to the rear would be built off the highest point of the ground level to the northwest rear corner of the house and it would extend to the opposite side elevation. On the west side the decking would be set in from the side of the proposed extension and the existing boundary fence would remain. As the decking would not be much higher than the existing ground level the position of the decking would not have any seriously detrimental impact on residential amenity at the rear of no.7 next door.
- No.11 to the east has a slightly lower ground level compared to the site but the decking would be no closer to the shared boundary than the extension and there is an existing detached garage at the rear of no.11 which would screen any views to and from the proposed decked area. As such the decking would not have any significant detrimental effect on residential amenity at the rear of no.11 Silverdale Avenue.
- Properties along Silverdale Avenue have different roof styles and heights, and the land slopes naturally down to the east. The proposed roof would be higher compared to both

the adjacent dwellings and the increase in height may have some detrimental impact on the path of sunlight to the rear of no.11 at the latter part of the day only, but not enough to warrant refusal of the proposal and as the site is northeast of no.7 it would not have much more of an impact on light to no.7 than the existing building on site is now.

- The drawings show that all of the development would take place 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 from 3 to 6 and SPD6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered. This can then require the proposal to provide a maximum of 3 parking spaces. The site as existing has a drive at the front for one vehicle and this would be unaffected by the proposed development. The area has on street parking and there is public transport available nearby. In this instance it is considered that the parking arrangements are sufficient and there are not grounds for refusal.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would, by reason of its size, position and design, be a significantly 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 following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and associated 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 - 01/09/2026		HL 01.09.2026	