

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 28/08/2025	Ref: 71572/FUL
Registration: 10/02/2025	LDfC: 06/03/2025	Expiry Date: 07/04/2025
Site Visit: 25/04/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
11:00:00		
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Loft conversion with raised ridge and front and rear dormers

Location: 15 Bishops Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0HT

Description

The property is a semi detached house located on residential street wit similar properties. The premises has a paved drive to the front and garden to the rear. To the north side is No.17. It sits at a higher level and is screened from the application site by fencing over 2m. It has a single storey to the boundary which is marginally shallower than No.15.

Planning permission is sought for a loft conversion with raised ridge and front and rear dormers. The proposal is to extend the height of the existing ridge by 1050mm and to add a single pitched roof dormer to the front. There would also be a larger L-shaped dormer to the rear with a flat roof. The loft conversion would facilitate 2 additional bedrooms. There would also be a pitched roof dormer to the front. The development would be constructed using matching materials.

Following negotiations with the agent amended plans showing a reduced dormer has been received. The l-shaped element of the proposed dormer would project 2.2m beyond the main roof to the rear instead of 4.1m as originally proposed.

Relevant Planning History

02101/E - Single storey rear extension - Enquiry completed 07/03/2018
47057 - TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT SIDE AND REAR; SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT REAR; FRONT PORCH - Refused 30/11/2006
47493 - TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT SIDE AND REAR; SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT REAR; FRONT PORCH (RESUBMISSION) - Approve with Conditions 20/02/2007
48679 - TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT SIDE AND REAR; SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT REAR. (RESUBMISSION) - Approve with Conditions 25/10/2007
62622 - Single storey extension at rear - Approve with Conditions 03/05/2018
18/0053 - Breach of condition no 4. of planning permission 48679 - 11/06/2018.

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent on 12/02/2025. No objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

N/A

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

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), 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.

The proposed additional height to the roof's ridge would be excessive given that the roof of the attached property would not be raised. However, the dormer to the front would not occupy a disproportionate area of the front roof slope. The proposed rear dormer would also be reasonably sized following the amendments. The I-shaped element of the proposed rear dormer would project 2.2m beyond the main roof to the rear instead of 4.1m as originally proposed. This would be a significant improvement and as such, would now be acceptable. The design of the proposed front dormer with its pitched roof would also be acceptable. Moreover, there number of designs similar to the proposed development within this street.

However, the proposal would overall be unacceptable due to the raising of the roof's ridge height. The attached property would remain as existing. This would therefore create an unbalanced prominent feature in the street scene. Furthermore, the plans shows the removal of the existing chimney. This would require a Certificate B which has not been submitted.

Therefore, the proposed development would not comply with Policies H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

Residential amenity

UDP policy H2/3 and SPD6 seeks to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The properties opposite to the front would be over 20m away and as such, there would be no detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties. There would also be a sufficient distance between the proposed rear dormer and the properties to the rear beyond the shared boundary. Additionally the proposed rear dormer would have no proposed side windows and as such, there would be no detrimental impact on the adjacent properties.

The proposed development would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Highways

The proposal will not result in changes to the parking layout. Therefore, the parking 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 proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would, by reason of its height, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy(ies) of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
MW	28/08/2025		