

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mo Warsame	Date of report: 21/07/2025	Ref: 71923/FUL
Registration: 27/05/2025	LDFC: 27/05/2025	Expiry Date: 22/07/2025
Site Visit: 11/07/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
12:00:00		
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 extension at front/side

Location: 8 Tamworth Avenue, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 6UL

Description

The property is a semi-detached brick and tile two storey dwelling house. The premises has a large drive to the front, garage to the side and garden to the rear. The adjacent neighbouring properties are No. 6 and No.10 (attached).

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey extension at front/side. The front element would project 1.75m to the front and would extend the existing garage to the principal rear elevation. The existing garage would also be converted into habitable space. The development would have a pitched roof with roof lights above the side element. The proposal would utilise the use of matching materials and would accommodate a porch, bathroom, cloak area, a utility and kitchen extension.

Relevant Planning History

62101 - Prior notification of proposed single storey rear extension - Prior Approval Not Required - Extension 23/11/2017.

Publicity

Neighbour letters was sent on 27/05/2025. 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 persons who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons 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 development would be a wrap-around front and side extension. The development would project 1.75m to the front, and extend the existing garage to the rear, effectively aligning it with principal rear elevation. The extension would have simple and unobtrusive design, which would not detract from the character of the dwelling.

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.

It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling, street scene or neighbouring properties and would therefore comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

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

- The extension would have no proposed side windows and there would be 20 metres to the nearest properties beyond the shared rear boundary. This exceeds the 13 metres required by SPD 6.
- The single storey side extension would be shaded by an identical side extension along the shared boundary (No.6).
- The proposed front extension would be modest and would not interfere with the existing parking arrangement.

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

Parking

The proposal will result in no additional bedroom and there will be no changes to site access, or parking. The parking at its current condition meets the maximum parking requirements.

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 01, 02, 03, 04, 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 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	21/07/2025	DM	22/7/25