

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 16/09/2026	Ref: 73447/FUL
Registration: 24/07/2026	LDFC: 16/09/2026	Expiry Date: 18/09/2026
Site Visit: 30/07/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 0	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Single storey side extension

Location: 20 Ross Avenue, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 7FH

Description

The application relates to a two storey detached dwelling house located on Ross Avenue. The premises has a driveway to the front, leading to an attached single storey single garage. An area of soft landscaping is also located to the front of the dwelling. To the rear the dwelling has been extended at single storey. An area of private residential amenity space is also located to the rear of the site.

Planning permission is sought for the removal of the existing garage and for the construction of a single storey side extension that projects approximately 5510mm to the side of the dwelling.

Relevant Planning History

None

Publicity

Letters sent to neighbouring properties 28/07/2026 and 25/08/2026.

No representations received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
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 existing garage extension is set back from the principal front elevation of the dwelling with the rear elevation aligned with the existing single storey rear extension. The proposed side extension would also tie in with the rear elevation of the existing rear elevation however it would project further forward, and closer to the shared boundary with No. 22 Ross Avenue.

The proposed extension is contemporary in design, with a staggered frontage and skillion style roof design. Whilst it would not match the original property in terms of materials and design, due to the scale of the proposal it is considered that it would not overwhelm or dominate the original property. The contrasting materials and design make it clear that the proposal is a later addition and whilst the design is different the openings, and eaves proposed do tie in with the proportions of the original dwelling and existing rear extension and as such the proposal is of a suitable scale and massing.

Whilst the proposal would lead to some loss of soft landscaping to the front, to re-provide parking lost by the extension this area of soft landscaping is located to the rear of the existing front boundary wall and as such not readily visible within the streetscene with only glimpses available from the driveway entrance. As such it is considered that the loss of the area of soft landscaping would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the streetscene.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposal complies with the Policy considerations set out above.

Residential Amenity

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

- The proposed extension would project beyond the principal front elevation of No. 22 however this property has a garage immediately adjacent to the shared boundary. The proposed extension would not impact on a 45 degree line as taken from the nearest front, ground floor habitable room of No. 22 and would therefore be acceptable.
- The proposed extension would not project beyond the principal rear elevation of No. 22.
- The proposed extension would be located adjacent to the side elevation of No. 22 rather than a principal elevation.
- The proposed extension would be screened from the dwellings located to the south of the site by the existing dwelling.
- The proposed rear windows would be screened by the existing rear boundary treatments and would be not closer to the rear boundary than the existing windows within the existing rear extension.
- The proposed front windows/door would be separated from the directly facing site by a driveway and highway and therefore no undue loss of privacy is foreseen.
- No side windows proposed.
- Due to the nature of rooflights no undue loss of privacy is foreseen.

Parking

The proposed site plans do indicate that the proposal would lead to a loss of parking on site, to the side of the dwelling. The site is located within Zone 4, and the property appears to be a 4no. bed dwelling. SPD 11 would therefore require 3no. parking spaces to be accommodated. The proposed site plan shows that 4no. cars can be accommodated to the front/side of the property and a permeable block paved drive has been shown on the proposed site plan. As such it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on in curtilage car parking.

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.

DELEGATED REPORT

- 2 This decision relates to drawings numbered JCBD-26-554 - 8. Rev01, JCBD-26-554-4, JCBD-26-554-3 Revision 00, JCBD-26-554-2 Revision 00, JCBD-26-554-1 Revision 00 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>
HP	16/09/2026	DM	17.09.2026