

DELEGATED REPORT**Report by** Amanda**Date of report:** 12/08/2026**Ref:**73327/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 15/06/2026**LDfC:** 10/07/2026**Expiry Date:** 10/08/2026**Site Visit:** 07/08/2026**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/single storey side/rear extension; Single storey rear extension**Location:** 74 Meade Hill Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M8 4LP**Description**

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached house with bay windows to the front elevation. The whole of the front is paved providing on site parking for at least two vehicles. Along the front boundary is a low brick wall with pillars to either side of the access. There is a short fence along both side boundaries to the front. At the rear there is a detached garage with a patio adjacent leading to a long garden. There is an area of trees directly to the rear of the site.

The proposal is to build a two storey/single storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension. The front of the extension would be built flush with the existing front elevation and it would measure 1.78m wide. It would measure 12.8m along the side. The first floor would be set back by 1m from the existing front elevation. The side elevation would be 675mm away from the side boundary fence.

At the rear the extension would have an overall projection of 5m but it would be stepped back along the shared boundary with the attached neighbour, where it would project 4m from the original rear elevation. The two storey element would be built on the southeast side of the existing dwelling and it would measure 4.43m across the rear and would project 5m from the original rear elevation. The roof would be hipped and there would be three new windows installed in the side elevation.

The rear extension along the shared boundary with no.72 Meade Hill Road, attached, would be single storey and it would project 4m adjacent to the boundary. It would have a mono-pitched roof with one rooflight. The existing detached garage is to be demolished.

Relevant Planning History

N/A

Publicity

4 neighbours notified on 19/06/2026 - 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.

The proposed extensions would be built with a design and finished materials that would be considered to be in keeping with the existing building, as well as with others along Meade Hill Road.

The 1m first floor set back at the front and the gap to the side boundary measuring 675mm would mean that there would be no concerns regards terracing with the adjacent dwelling, and there would be no seriously detrimental impact on the character of the existing streetscene. The design of the proposal is considered acceptable in this location.

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 -

- There would be approximately 7m from the front of the extension to the front site boundary. This would be in line with the requirements as set out in SPD 6.
- Parking on site to the front of the dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed development.
- At the rear there would be approximately 25m from the rear of the two storey extension to the rear site boundary and directly to the rear of the site there is an area of trees with the Metrolink tracks beyond. As such the distance to any residential properties to the rear of the site is more than sufficient.
- The single storey rear extension would project 4m along the shared boundary with the attached neighbour, 72 Meade Hill Road. As there is an existing conservatory on the rear of no.72 which appears to project a similar length, next to the shared boundary it is considered that the single storey extension would not have any significant detrimental impact on residential amenity at this particular property, and its garden.
- The two storey extension would be built approximately 3.48m away from the shared boundary with no.72. As such the 45° rule would be satisfied regards any windows to the rear of the attached dwelling.
- No.76, to the opposite side has an existing two storey side/rear extension. The proposed two storey extension would extend out to a similar point at the rear. As such the proposed extension would not have any seriously detrimental effect on residential amenity at the rear of no.76 next door.
- No.76 Meade Hill Road is also owned by the applicant and they extended that property with a similar design in 2020. There are two bedroom windows installed to the side elevation of that property. It is noted that when the development at no.76 was approved the agent/applicant had agreed that if no.74 were to be extended in the future the two windows to the side elevation would not be protected in the same way as habitable room windows would be if they were original to the building, or to the front and rear elevations. As such, although the two storey extension would be approximately 1.6m away from the side of no.76, and would have a detrimental impact on light and views to and from the side windows it would be considered acceptable in this instance.
- The proposed side extension would have three windows to the side, all to non-habitable rooms (a study, walk in wardrobe and a bathroom). These windows would be approximately 1.6m away from the side of no.76 next door. As the rooms will be for non-habitable use the windows would be obscurely glazed. This would ensure privacy levels would be retained between the two properties. A condition would be added to the decision to ensure that the windows would be installed with obscure glazing and would remain as such at all times in the future.

Taking the above into account 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.

Parking -

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 5 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 to the front which could accommodate at least two vehicles. The area has on street parking and there is public transport available. In this instance then the parking arrangements are considered sufficient.

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 1 of 10, 2 of 10, 3 of 10, 4 of 10, 8 of 10, 9 of 10 and 10 of 10 received on 16/06/2026 and drawings numbered 5 of 10, 6 of 10 and 7 of 10 received on 11/08/2026 as modified by the email from Mr Kevin Foey dated 11/08/2026. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details 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 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.
- 4 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted all of the windows to the east side elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
Reason. To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers and to accord with 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 12/8/26		DM 13/8/2026	