

## DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

25/00275/HOUS

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 11.07.2025 EXT OF TIME

Address: 28 Kirkfell Drive Middleton M24 5AP

**Proposal:** Single storey side extension including roof lights and alteration to fenestration

|           |                            |   |                       |     |
|-----------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|-----|
| PUBLICITY | Weekly list expired?       | Y | Site notice expired?  | N/A |
|           | Neighbour letters expired? | Y | Press Notice expired? | N/A |

|            |                                                             |   |                                        |   |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------|---|
| DELEGATION | Significant departure from local plan?                      | N | Contrary to national policy?           | N |
|            | Applicant a Council Member or officer?                      | N | Contrary to previous decision?         | N |
|            | Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval? | N | Called in or Planning Panel objection? | N |

|          |                                   |   |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| COMMENTS | Planning Panel comments received? | N |
|          | Neighbour comments received?      | N |

|     |                                                  |   |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|---|
| EIA | Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase? | N |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|---|

|            |                                                                      |     |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CONDITIONS | Pre-commencement conditions proposed?                                | N   |
|            | Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)? | N/A |

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to conditions

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 11/07/2025

## **SITE**

The site is located at 28 Kirkfell Drive Middleton. This is a two storey semi detached dwelling. The house forms part of a recently completed residential estate, with neighbouring houses sharing similar forms and character. The property is accessed off Esthwaite Close and benefits from off street parking to the side and has a rear amenity space.

## **PROPOSAL**

The application seeks permission for a single storey side extension. The proposed development will provide additional living space. The proposed arrangement will leave one external parking space approx. 6.5m in length.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### **National**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### **Sub – Regional**

#### **Places For Everyone PfE**

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

### **Local**

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:  
**G/D/1** Defined Urban Area

#### **Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:**

**P3** Improving Design of New Development  
**DM1** General Development Requirements  
**T2** Improving Accessibility  
**Appendix 5** Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

## **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

15/01195/OUT - Outline application (including access) for up to 150 dwellings (Use Class C3), potential primary school site with associated landscaping, open space, access arrangements and car parking provision (Resubmission of 14/00851/OUT) – Approved.

18/01403/REM - Submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 15/01195/OUT relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 117 dwellings – Approved.

## **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

### **Highways**

No objection

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding properties and no comments have been received.

## **ANALYSIS**

### **Principle of Development**

The property is on land designated as Protected Open Land however the site has been developed with a large housing estate. In principle further alterations to houses built as part of the estate are considered acceptable.

### **Design**

Policies P1, P3 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policies P1, P3 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, in addition to requiring a number of other basic planning considerations. Development that is not well designed should be refused.

Permitted development rights for side extensions have been removed for this dwelling and all residential dwellings forming part of the estate approved under permission 18/01403/REM. This limitation was placed to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties and ensure sufficient parking is retained at each property. As such, no side extensions can be added to the application building without planning permission.

The proposed development is a single storey extension and would be approx. 3m in wide, this will take up the full width of the driveway. Due to the orientation of the dwelling and neighboring dwelling, some visual space would be left between dwellings. The proposed development is of an appropriate design and scale for the street scene.

As such, the proposed side extension is considered to achieve an acceptable standard of design. It would therefore not accord with with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

### **Impact on Surrounding Occupiers**

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

The proposed development will not windows on the side elevation of the proposed development, as a result there will be no impact on neighbour amenity. The proposed window on the front elevation will maintain same separation distance as the existing windows on the front elevation.

The proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of light and outlook. A sufficient amount of garden space would be left for existing and future occupiers and is considered acceptable.

As such, it is considered that the proposals would comprise an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers and accord with the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location. Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The proposal will result in a smaller driveway to the front of the dwelling sufficient to provide one parking space, compared to the existing space which is sufficient to accommodate two cars.

As part of the application the Council's Highways Officer has been consulted and raised no objections to the proposed development.

It is noted that a planning condition was imposed on the reserved matters approval for the planning permission for the estate which prevents side extensions without planning permission - which may otherwise comprise permitted development - in order to ensure that adequate provision for off-street parking is retained. One off street parking space will be retained and this is considered acceptable.

As such it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on public and highway safety contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT subject to conditions

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 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. This permission relates to the following plans and document:

- Location Plan
- Existing and Proposed Site Plans Sheet 8
- Existing and Proposed Roof Plans Sheet 3
- Proposed Plans Sheet 5
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 7

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of

the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture, except as specified in the application.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Procedure Statement**

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 to issue the decision without delay.

Report Author Aimee Bovaird