

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 19/02/2025	Ref: 71314/FUL
Registration: 22/11/2024	LDFC: 30/12/2024	Expiry Date: 17/01/2025
Site Visit: 13/12/2024	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
10:00:00		
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey side extension, front porch with ramp and timber fence boundary treatment

Location: 23 Winchester Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0LJ

Description

The property is a two storey semi-detached property with bay windows that is situated on a corner plot. The premises has a drive to the front and gardens to the front, side and rear. The attached property is No. 21 Winchester Avenue and the properties on the other side are separate by a highway.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side extension along with 1.8m fencing to the side. The proposal would also include a proposed front porch together with a ramp to the front. The proposed side extension would project 5m to the side. However, there would an additional rectangular box to the side near the front elevation. This would be attached to the rest of the proposed side extension and would project 2.2m to side beyond the 5m point and run 3.5m to the rear before reconnecting to the 5m point. The development would have a pitched, mansard roof with sunroof over the single storey side extension and pitched gable roof over the proposed porch. The proposal would accommodate a new entrance hall, an additional bedroom with en suite, utility area and a kitchen/diner extension with sukkah roof. The proposed development would be constructed with some matching materials.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent on 03/12/2024. No objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations

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

UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to achieve a high standard of design that compliments the original building, does not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of neighbouring properties, and protects the general street scene.

SPD 6 states, that side extensions on corner plots should maintain a gap of at least 2 metres to the side boundary with the adjacent highway. Even though, the side extension would fail to maintain a gap of at least 2 metres along its entire length, it would however have a gap of over 2m on average. Furthermore, the scale of the development has been drastically reduced on the new revised plans. This also include a new pitched mansard roof

instead of the the initially proposed flat roof. The development would now appear more aesthetically pleasing and as such would be more in line with the character of the host property and the street scene.

The proposed single storey side extension would be a relatively large extension. But following amendments, the scale of the extension would now be drastically smaller than the original proposed plan. Moreover, it would be situated on a large corner plot and would now have a design that would be simple and unobtrusive. For example, the new pitched mansard roof would further enhance the design of the proposed extension as it would now appear subservient to the host property. Overall, the proposed extension would not detract from the character of the dwelling. Situated to the side, the single storey extension would be visible from the street scene. However, the existing high scrubs to the side and the proposed 1.8m fencing would mostly shade the proposed development.

The proposed fence would be 1.8m high and would have concrete posts with timber panels which would not be considered unusual on this type of estate. The fencing at the front of the site would be 1.3m high for improved visibility. The design of the fence is considered acceptable in this location.

The proposed front porch would be a modest structure with splayed corners projecting 1.3m to the front. It would have pitched front gable roof and would be accessed via ramp to the side and a set of small stairs to the front which would be appropriate for this type of property. The proposed fence to the side would be 1.8m high and it would have a common design that would not detract from the character of the street scene.

Overall, the proposal would be constructed with materials to match the existing dwelling. As such, the proposed development would not be a prominent feature in the street scene and would comply with Policies H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

Residential Amenity

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

- In terms of overlooking and privacy to the side, there would be a sufficient distance to the side boundary and there would be a highway beyond. Furthermore, there would be no proposed side windows. Additionally, the existing high scrubs along with the proposed 1.8m fence to the side would further shade the development.
- In terms of overlooking and privacy to the front and rear, the single storey side extension would not project beyond the principal front and rear elevations and such, there would be no detrimental impact on the residential amenities enjoyed by those neighbours.
- The proposed front porch and ramp would not have any detrimental impact on the existing parking arrangements and as such would be considered acceptable.

Overall, there would be no serious impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore conforms to UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Highways

The proposal will result in one additional bedroom and there will be no changes to the parking layout. Therefore, the driveway at its current condition would meet the maximum parking requirements.

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

The Local Planning Authority worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. 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 dwg no. 001.3 (Rev 3), dwg no. 002, .dwg no. 003.10 (Rev 10), dwg no. 301 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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
MW	19/02/2025	DM -	20/02/2025