
MEETING: PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

DATE: 28 JUE 2005

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR
DOMESTIC EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS

REPORT FROM: TOM MITCHELL, DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

CONTACT OFFICER: JAN BREJWO, PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER

TYPE OF DECISION: NON-KEY

REPORT STATUS: FOR APPROVAL

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

This report concerns a draft amended version of Development Control Policy Guidance Note 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDED OPTION (with reasons):

Members are being requested to approve for consultation purposes the draft amended version of the Guidance Note.

IMPLICATIONS -

**Financial Implications and
Risk Considerations**

There are no resource implications arising directly from the amended SPG on domestic extensions and alterations

Corporate Aims/Policy Framework:

Do the proposals accord with the Policy Framework? Yes

Are there any legal implications? No
Considered by Monitoring Officer: Yes

**Statement by Director of Finance
and E-Government:**

There are no resource implications arising directly from the SPG on domestic extensions

and alterations.

Staffing/ICT/Property:

Wards Affected: All Wards

Scrutiny Interest:

TRACKING/PROCESS

DIRECTOR:

Chief Executive/ Management Board	Executive Member/ Chair	Ward Members	Partners
Scrutiny Panel	Executive	Committee	Council

1.0 BACKGROUND

Members will recall that Development Control Policy Guidance Note 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties was adopted on 17th March 2004. This Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) supports Policy H2/3 Extensions and Alterations of the Unitary Development Plan which gives only very generalised guidance regarding the consideration of applications for house extensions and alterations. It was prepared in accordance with the advice in PPG 12: Development Plans.

Since its adoption all planning applications for domestic extensions are assessed against the detailed guidelines and criteria contained within the SPG and the document sets out standards to be achieved in a range of domestic developments and helps to maintain a good level of consistency in decision making. Following the adoption of the document, almost all decisions on householder applications are made under delegated powers and only those proposals that are in conformity with the SPG guidelines are normally approved. As a basis for the system of delegated decisions on householder applications, the SPG has been an important factor in achieving the current good overall level of performance on the speed of decision making.

2.0 ISSUES

The SPG has generally fulfilled its intended function well but, because of the detailed nature of the advice and the variety of situations that can occur, some parts of the advice have been found to be in need of amendment or

clarification in the light of experience during the period of over a year that the document has been in place.

Following the adoption of the SPG it was anticipated that there would be strong support for the Council's decisions from appeal inspectors. However, that support has not reached the level that was expected. For example, between March 2004 and February 2005 out of a total of 23 appeal decisions on domestic extensions 13 were allowed. This gives an average rate of appeals allowed for this type of development of about 56% which does not compare favourably with the national average of 33% for all appeals allowed. A local target of 35% for all appeals allowed has been included within the Council's Best Value Performance Plan. Additionally, the government has indicated that poor performance on appeals will reduce the level of Planning Delivery Grant awarded for 2005/6 and the grant will be affected where the number of appeals allowed is 40% greater than the national average, giving a "target" for performance in terms of PDG of about 46% currently. This highlights the importance of improving performance on appeals involving domestic developments.

Against this background there has been an identified need to clarify or amend those sections of the SPG which have been recognised as causing difficulties and those that may have been affecting the level of performance at appeal. Accordingly, the amendments thought to be necessary have been carried out and are being put forward as a draft amended version of the SPG for consideration with a view to this version being substituted for the current document.

The general layout and most of the text and diagrams of the adopted SPG remain unchanged in the draft amended version. Those sections of the text that have been amended are in italics. One diagram, diagram 7 has been revised to reflect a change in the advice. Appendix 2 which provides guidance to applicants and agents about the submission of an application has been substantially changed to reflect the contents of the Validation Checklist for Householder Applications that has recently been issued.

Within the text the main areas of change are as follows:

Paragraph 2.2 concerning aspects now covers situations involving a significant change of levels between properties or cases where buildings that are higher than single or two storeys.

Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.7 concerning single and two storey side extensions would provide more flexibility for considering extensions in corner situations. This is in response to a relatively low degree of support for the Council's decisions to refuse on appeal.

Paragraph 3.8 regarding two storey rear extensions has been amended in order to reflect more the added impact of a two storey or first floor extension compared with that of a single storey structure.

Paragraph 3.11 concerning dormer/roof extensions has changes to provide a more flexible approach regarding the width of dormer extensions but also to secure more restrictions on their relative height in relation to the roof ridge

and to ensure that aspect distances would be taken into account. The Council has had a relatively low degree of support on appeal following the refusal of dormer extensions on design grounds.

Paragraph 4.1. A new section has been added to take account of a visual amenity problem that can arise due to the need for householders to store additional wheelie bins and recycling containers.

Appendix 1. The text concerning the 45deg rule now takes into account situations when there is a conservatory elevation next door rather than a conventional window. It also sets a limit on the distance out from the affected window within which the rule would be applied.

3.0 CONCLUSION

As intended, the adopted SPG provides further advice and clarity on the Council's standards for certain types of extensions and alterations to domestic properties. It has proved to be a very useful document for householders and their agents in designing their proposals and for planning officers in determining whether planning permission should be granted.

In the light of experience over more than a year that the SPG has been in place there has, however, arisen a need to amend parts of the advice. Members are, therefore, being asked to approve the draft amended version of the SPG for external consultation purposes.

**TOM MITCHELL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGER**

List of Background Papers:-

- Bury Unitary Development Plan (August 1997)
- Development Control Policy Guidance Note 6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (March 2004)

Contact Details:-

Tom Mitchell
Development Manager
Planning & Economic Development Division
2nd Floor
Craig House
5 Bank Street
Bury BL9 0DN
Tel: 0161 253 5321
e-mail t.mitchell@bury.gov.uk