

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Amanda

Date of report: 21/09/2023

Ref:69877/FUL

Uhunmwagho

Registration: 01/08/2023

LDfC: 22/08/2023

Expiry Date: 26/09/2023

Site Visit: 08/09/2023

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: N/A

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Location: 9 Plantation View, Summerseat, Bury, BL9 5PT

Description

The application relates to a two storey mid-terrace house with rooms in the roof space. At the front the property is accessed via a footpath and there is a road to the rear. The extension is virtually complete, as is the extension at no.10 nextdoor. No.8 is not extended to the rear and there is a kitchen window closest to the rear boundary at ground floor, with a bedroom above.

The extension projects 2.92m from the original rear elevation and it extends across the whole of the rear elevation. It has been built adjoining the extension at no.10. The roof is mono-pitched with two rooflights. The roof and walls have been finished with materials to match the existing dwelling. The building lies within the designated Green Belt.

Relevant Planning History

23/0298 - Single storey rear extension -

Publicity

Neighbours notified on 01/08/2023 - No comments or objections received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

OL1	Green Belt
EN9/1	Special Landscape Areas
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
EN6/4	Wildlife Links and Corridors
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.

The main considerations of this application are the impact of the proposal on visual and residential amenity, and the impact of the proposal on the surrounding Green Belt..

Principle (Green Belt)

Paragraphs 147 and 148 state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC). Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. VSC will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF regards the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate development. Exceptions to this are:

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;

b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not

conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

Policy OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for agriculture and forestry; essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation; limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings provided that this would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling; and limited infilling in existing villages as set out under Policy OL1/3.

This is further supported by Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt which state that extensions of existing dwellings should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. To assist in what can be considered to be disproportionate SPD 8 considers additions of up to a third (33%). However, that is not to say something larger, or smaller than 33%, would not be supported as each case is considered on its own merits.

The proposal would constitute an alteration to the existing dwelling house. Volume calculations submitted by the agent advise that the proposed extension equates to a volume increase of 12.25%. As the proposed extension would therefore be less than 33% of the volume of the original building it would comply with guidance.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not lead to a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling and would therefore not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt complying with the policy considerations set out above.

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 extension has been built on the rear elevation of the property but is fully visible from the highway at the rear and other properties. It has been built with a design and materials that are considered to be in keeping with the existing building and as such would not cause any significant detrimental harm to the character of the existing streetscene.

Given the above the proposal conforms to Bury UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of visual amenity.

Residential Amenity -

- The separation distance to properties to the rear would be more than acceptable in terms of SPD 6.
- As it would project less than 3m and the side elevation is position within the site boundary to the south, the extension would be considered acceptable in terms of

residential amenity at no.8 next door, which has a kitchen window closest to the shared boundary.

- The extension has been built adjoining the extension at no.10 to the north. As certificate B has been submitted with the application and notice was served on the owner of no.10 the applicant has satisfied the requirements in terms of what is expected of them for the purpose of the planning application. Any future issues concerning the party wall would be a civil matter between the applicant and the owner of no.10 Plantation View.
- According to the proposed site plan there is around 4.2m remaining to the rear boundary. This would be considered sub-standard in terms of drive length where SPD 6 advises a driveway should measure at least 5m in length, but in some circumstances a lesser distance of 4.8m may be acceptable. With regards to this particular site the drive length would be significantly less than what is normally required. However, had the extension been built wholly within the site boundary, unattached from the neighbouring extension, it is likely it could have been built as permitted development, regardless of whatever length of drive way would remain to the rear. Taking this in to account and that there are no parking restrictions to the highway at the rear the sub-standard drive length would be considered acceptable in this instance.

The proposal conforms to UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the requirements of Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties in terms of separation distance to the surrounding properties and that it is no more than 3m on the boundary.

Parking -

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms therefore SPD 11 Parking Standards need not be considered. There are no parking restrictions to the highway at the rear of the site.

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 R-0795-01, R-0795-02A, R-0795-05 and R0795-06 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 UDP Policy H2/3 - Extensions and Alterations and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.
- 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>
AU - 21/09/2023			