

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 08/11/2023	Ref: 69857/FUL
Registration: 19/09/2023	LDfC: 18/10/2023	Expiry Date: 14/11/2023
Site Visit: 04/10/2023	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: Single storey extensions at front and rear

Location: 91 Ringley Road West, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1DW

Description

The application relates to a brick built mid-terraced dwelling which is located within a row of similar type houses. The row of houses front a main road and there is an unmade side road which provides access to the rear of the properties. Beyond the access route to the south are open fields. The dwelling has a small front garden and in the rear yard there is a detached garage/store .

The site is located in the Green Belt.

The application seeks the erection of a front porch and a single storey rear extension. The existing garage/store would be demolished.

The front porch would project 1.6 from the front elevation, be approx. 2m wide and 2.5m high and would be clad in timber.

The rear extension would extend 3.05m and extend across the full rear elevation and tie into the adjacent houses. Certificate B has been signed and appropriate notice served to the adjacent neighbours.

The total volume of the extensions would equate to approx 37cubic m.

Relevant Planning History

N/a

Publicity

Letteers sent to 4 porperties on 26/9/23.
No responses received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/a

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
OL1/1	Designation of Green Belt
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
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.

Green Belt

Policy OL1/2 states that extensions should not be disproportionate additions over and above the existing dwelling.

The proposed extensions would result in a volume increase of built development of approx. 19% above the existing volume.

In total, the proposed extensions are considered to be relatively small in scale comparative to the existing property and given their position on the house would not significantly harm the openness of the Green Belt.

As such the proposed development would comply with OL1/2.

Impact on visual amenity

The proposed porch would be formed on part of the front elevation and there would be a distance of 3.4m from the end of the porch to the front garden wall and as such it is considered not to project unduly into the streetscene. Elevations would comprise a solid front entrance door and timber cladding. Whilst there are no other examples of timber structures in the street scene, as a relatively small scale build, it is considered the proposed porch would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the streetscape. It is also noted that the size of the porch would only be 0.2m larger than that allowed under permitted development.

The rear extension would project 3m from the existing back wall and extend across the full rear elevation. It would have a flat roof with roof lantern feature and full height glazed windows and similar in size and scale to other types of extensions added to terraced properties. Located at the rear it would not be highly visible to public views. As such the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on visual amenity. The proposed development is therefore considered acceptable and would comply with EN1/2 and OL1/2

Impact on residential amenity

The porch would extend 1.6m beyond the front window of No 93. Whilst it would have some impact on light this property, the size of the porch would have limited impact on the neighbour.

SPD6 allows for rear extensions to project 3m along a shared boundary. The proposed extension would project 3.05m along the boundary with Nos 89 and 93. Both neighbours either side also have rear extensions. As such the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity to the neighbouring properties.

As such, the proposed development is considered acceptable and would comply with H2/3.

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 Revised existing and proposed plans and elevations 2618_RAD_01_Planning_Rev A 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.

- 3 The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall be provided as detailed on the approved plans.

Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT	8/11/23		