

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 27/07/2022	Ref: 68455/FUL
Registration: 13/05/2022	LDfC: 30/06/2022	Expiry Date: 08/07/2022
Site Visit: 29/06/2022	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey extension at front; First floor extension at rear and Detached outbuilding at side/rear

Location: 2 Watkins Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0DS

Description

The property is a two storey link detached house that has been extended two storey at the side. To the front is a graveled drive and there is garden to the side and rear. The garden area to the side is at a raised level with steps up and there are conifers along the boundary with the neighbour at 7 Meade Hill Road. 4 Watkins Drive is the neighbour linked by their garage and that to the site which has been converted to a room. To the rear the site borders the rear gardens to 12,14 &16 Lyndhurst Ave.

The application includes a single storey extension at the front 1.8m deep and 5.1m across to form an entrance. To the rear a first floor would come out 2.2m in depth for 4.7m across to add a bedroom. To the end of the raised side garden an outbuilding would be constructed with a footprint of 9.5m by 4.5m and dual pitch roof with a ridge to 3.7m. It would form an office and gym.

Relevant Planning History

36603 - Two storey extension at side and erection of 1.8m high fence - AC 13/09/00.

Publicity

Surrounding neighbours were notified by letter and no responses have been received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

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 and design - The proposed front extension would not project excessively. It would have a tiled dual pitched roof with glazing to the front and sides and the walls in render.

The first floor to the rear would have a dual pitched roof forming a rear gable and be adjacent an existing gable with the walls finished in render.

The outbuilding would be of brick construction and located to the area of the side garden which is raised and where there is currently a shed. At 3.7m to the ridge the building would be of a typical size for a domestic outbuilding and the site conifers would provide screening.

The proposal is considered acceptable, the extension in keeping with the existing property, and would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Parking - The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4 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 parking at the front the proposed site plan noting 3 spaces. The drive to the front of the converted garage would be over 5m in length and a second space is accommodated at an angle as the applicant parks at present. The front extension would reduce the length in front of it to less than 5m therefore the third space as shown on the

DELEGATED REPORT

plan would be sub standard. With two spaces, and garden to the front with potential for further parking should the applicant require it, the parking arrangements are considered sufficient. In addition the area has on street parking and there is also public transport available.

Residential amenity - There would be a distance in excess of 7m from the proposed first floor bedroom window to the rear boundary and it would sit adjacent an existing one. The outbuilding would be located to the boundary with 7 Meade Hill Road which has a conservatory extension close to the boundary. The proposed outbuilding would be blank wall along the rear elevation and the site and No.7 are well screened by conifers and fencing.

There would then be no serious impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbouring properties.

The proposal complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

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 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 2398_PRE_04_Planning 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.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JL	27/07/22		