

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Sam Summers	Date of report: 09/02/2022	Ref: 67703/FUL
Registration: 20/12/2021	LDfC: 12/01/2022	Expiry Date: 14/02/2022
Site Visit: 09/02/2022	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Retrospective single storey rear extension

Location: 37 Salisbury Road, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 4GD

Description

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling located on Salisbury Road. The premises has parking/garden to the front, with garden also located to the rear. Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey rear extension with pitched roof that projects approximately 2100mm. The extension has already been built, as such this is a retrospective application.

Relevant Planning History

65818 - Lawful development certificate for proposed single storey extension to the back of the property Refused 12/10/2020

Publicity

Letters sent - 21/12/2022 - 1 response received from nearby property - objection below:

I was not aware of this prior to the letter, however I have now searched and found that a previous application was rejected but the extension was built regardless. Having gone against a previous planning decision, according to the FAQ, is a material consideration and warrants commenting on. When I looked on the planning portal website I came across the following information. A retrospective application is for where work was done but an planning permission was not applied for. Where work is done after receiving a refusal this is classed as a planning breach. This sets a poor precedence for the council and opens up to everyone just building what they want then applying after.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - None

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

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) and 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 Policy 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.

The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the property, which is bounded by residential gardens. As such the rear extension would not be visible from the street scene. The extension is of a simple and unobtrusive design, which would not detract from the character of the property. The use of matching materials is appropriate. The proposal would not overwhelm the dwelling or result in over development of the associated residential amenity space.

It is therefore considered that the proposal complies 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.

- Proposed extension would not project more than 3 metres beyond the rear of No. 35

DELEGATED REPORT

- nor No. 37 complying with guidance contained within SPD 6.
- Proposed rear windows/doors would be screened by existing rear boundary treatments.
- No side windows proposed.

Response to neighbours

A refused lawful development certificate does not affect the granting of householder planning permission as they involve a separate set of rules and regulations. The council treats applications the same whether they are retrospective or not.

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 This decision relates to drawings numbered DB149-001 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 listed.
- 2 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>
SS	09/02/2022		