

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Steven Gunn
Russell

Date of report: 10/05/2022

Ref:68116/FUL

Registration: 21/02/2022

LDFC: 22/04/2022

Expiry Date: 18/04/2022

Site Visit: 15/03/2022

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: NONE

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension & Canopy to amended Front Entrance with Level Access

Location: 14 Freestone Close, Bury, BL8 1US

Description

The application relates to a two-storey detached house on a residential cul-de-sac of generally similar properties. The unattached neighbour has a single storey extension at the rear and on the other side there is a non-designated footpath leading to woodland. To the rear is extensive trees, shrubbery, and a river.

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey extension would that project out 2.88m (or 1.45 from the rear building line) and have a gable roof with patio doors and higher level glazing overlooking the rear garden. Materials would match existing except for black upvc doors/ window frames, while the rear walls would be Red Facing Brick & Polar White Render and Redland Regent Tiles for the roof and accommodate a lounge/diner at ground floor. There are no new side windows proposed. At the front there would also be a new external porch with pitched roof. There would be a separation of 9.5m to the rear boundary.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant

Publicity

Immediate neighbours notified by letter dated 01/03/2022 and 31/02/2022 sent to 2 (two) neighbours. No representations were received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Highways - additional parking space at the front of the property already agreed with Highways in advance of this application.

Pre-start Conditions

N/A

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

HT2/4 Car Parking and New Development

SPD11 Parking Standards in Bury

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 - 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.

In terms of design and appearance the extension is generally in-keeping with the existing house whilst providing a modern external design. Situated largely at the rear, the extension would not be readily visible from the public arena, although its design and scale is

considered to be appropriate for this property and streetscene. Materials would match existing plus black upvc doors/ windows and white render. The existing tree and shrub planting beyond the rear boundary would further reduce the impact as viewed from the rear.

The proposed front external porch with pitched roof is considered to be an acceptable design, size, and scale appropriate to the main house.

In this respect the extension complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

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

In terms of overlooking and privacy to the rear, the 9.5m separation distance to the rear boundary from the extension is considered to be acceptable and complies with adopted guidance in SPD6. The extension is acceptable in relation to the attached neighbour as it complies with the '45-degree rule' within SPD6. There are no side windows proposed.

In terms of the general prominence and impact on daylight the extension is set largely within the centre of the site and is to the north of No.12. No overshadowing is anticipated. The extension would be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

Highways - The proposal would involve the provision of an additional parking space at the front of the property, and this has been agreed with Highways in advance of this application.

Conclusion – In consideration of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of the design, and siting, of this development. As such, the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policy H2/3 and associated guidance in SPD6.

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 ADR-PD-CCL-02 RevA 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.

DELEGATED REPORT

- 3 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>
SGR	10/05/2022		