

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Charlotte Orrell	Date of report: 01/07/2026	Ref: 73207/FUL
Registration: 04/06/2026	LDfC: 30/06/2026	Expiry Date: 30/07/2026
Site Visit: 10/06/2026	Site Notice: 10/06/2026	Press Date: 18/06/2026
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: ASB
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: First floor extension at side/rear; Pergola to front elevation

Location: 44 Ringley Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 7LL

Description

The application property is a two storey detached dwelling on the north-western side of Ringley Road. The front of the property is separated by an access gate as well as a brick wall. Large hedges and trees form the remaining boundaries.

The proposal is to build a first floor extension to the side/rear together with a pergola to the front.

The proposed first floor extension would be sited over the existing single storey garage and would project approximately 10.4m and be 12.4m in width. It would incorporate a dual-pitched roof a maximum of 8.5m in height with an eaves height of 5.2m. A balcony is also incorporated into the extension a maximum of 2.8m in height.

The pergola would project 4m from the front elevation and would be 6.2m in width. It would incorporate a flat roof approximately 2.1m in height.

The area is residential in nature, predominantly of larger detached dwellings. Parking at the site is wholly off street with the site being large enough to accommodate multiple vehicles.

Relevant Planning History

09/0580 - UNAUTHORISED ADVERTISEMENT - 18/01/2010

Publicity

8 neighbouring properties were consulted on 09.06.2026. A site notice was erected on 10.06.2026. No comments or observations have been received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer - no objection

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PFE	Places for Everyone
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), 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

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 proposed first floor extension would be sited away from the street scene and therefore is unlikely to have an impact. Furthermore, the proposed roof has been designed sensitively in relation to the host dwelling, and is set down from the maximum ridge height in order to

appear as a consistent addition.

The proposed pergola would also not be visible from the street scene and therefore would be unlikely to have a visual impact on the street scene.

Materials proposed are complimentary to the host dwelling and bin storage would remain unchanged for storage of bins on non-collection days.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential dwellings.

360 Stand Lane is sited to the northern side of the host dwelling. The proposals, including the proposed balcony, would be sited in excess of 10m from this dwelling with no habitable room windows proposed to face this dwelling. This is more than the 9.5m guidance within SPD 6 and therefore considered acceptable. Furthermore, given the boundary treatment, it is unlikely an unacceptable privacy impact would be caused by the proposals.

Properties to the west/south-west retain over 21m, in excess of the 20m required under SPD 6 and over 7m is retained between neighbouring boundaries and proposed first floor habitable windows.

Properties to the west retain over 10m between neighbouring first floor elevations, which are also sited at an angle. Despite this and that 7m would not be retained between neighbouring boundaries, the first floor windows facing this neighbour are non habitable and so acceptable in this instance.

Properties to the south are sited in excess of 45m from the proposals, considered acceptable.

Parking

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 6 to 7 and SPD 6 requires parking spaces as set out in SPD 11 Parking Standards to be considered.

The dwelling is sited within Zone 4 with 4 bedroom homes and greater requiring 3 off road parking spaces. Given the parking provision required does not increase, and the parking provision at the property does not decrease due to the proposed, this would be acceptable.

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 204 and 11 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.

DELEGATED REPORT

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.

- 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>
CO 01.07.2026		HL 2/7/26	