

Application Number:	23/00814/HOUS
Location:	39 Canon Street Rochdale OL16 2TF
Proposal:	Single storey front porch including landscaping and erection of front and side boundary walls - retrospective (resubmission of 23/00418/HOUS)
Applicant:	Kamal Ali
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

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

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

Location

The application relates to no. 39 Canon Street, a two-storey end-terrace dwelling located in a residential area in Central Rochdale. The dwelling is situated on a corner plot and is adjoined by no. 41 Canon Street to the south-east, adjacent to no. 19 Bishop Street to the north, and faces the highway to the south-west. The dwelling benefits from a considerable front curtilage space and is sited on a lower level than the highway.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a single-storey front porch, which measures 3.02m in length and a maximum depth of 1.85m, with a ridge height of 3.32m and a height to eaves of 2.67m. It is characterised by a gable-fronted pitched roof and is constructed from redbrick and tiles, with a single strip of grey brick detailing above the front entrance door. It comprises a small window to the north-west facing side elevation wall.

The application is a resubmission of a previous application 23/00418/HOUS with amendments made to include a proposed landscaping scheme to the front curtilage

space, as well as proposed surface finishing to the existing front and side boundary treatments.

The landscaping scheme comprises of planting behind the existing boundary walls with the following specifications:

- ☐ Cherry laurel hedging at 90cm intervals along the front boundary walls;
- ☐ Three fruit trees along the south-east boundary wall; and
- ☐ One fruit tree at the north-west corner of the curtilage.

The boundary treatments comprises of 1m-high block walls with 1.5m-high piers at regular intervals. The walls would be finished with brick slips and topped off with black steel fencing.

Relevant History

21/00451/HH42 - Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 4.0m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 2.5m and height to eaves 2.5m) - Prior Approval Not Required

21/00561/HOUS - Two-storey side extension following demolition of existing porch - Grant subject to conditions

23/00047/HOUS - Erection of attached garage to side and formation of front driveway – Grant subject to conditions

23/00418/HOUS - Single storey front porch – retrospective – Refuse

Reason for Refusal:

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, height, roof form and design, the front porch constitute a disproportionate and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling which is not well-designed and appears out of keeping to the appearance of the host dwelling. The development represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and constitutes undue visual harm to the character and visual appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. It therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

Policy

National

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

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

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).

Amendments

The Local Planning Authority has worked proactively with the applicant to develop an amended scheme to address significant design concerns raised as part of 23/00418/HOUS. Amendments have been made to incorporate a landscaping scheme to the front curtilage space, as well as the application of brick slips to the constructed boundary walls.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring they are “*sympathetic to local character.*”
- ☐ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having*

regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.” In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be “in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”

- ② The surrounding street scene is characterised by terraced dwellings of a simple front elevation design, and comprises of modestly-sized flat roof front porches which appears to be original features of the properties. The adjoining building line has remained relatively unchanged and as such maintains a somewhat uniform appearance through its built forms.
- ② As assessed in the original submission’s Officer’s Report, the front porch extension constitutes a substantial and disproportionate enlargement to the host dwelling by virtue of its excessive scale and height, unsympathetic roof form, and prominence from the street scene, and thus is not acceptable.
- ② Following the refusal of the original application, extensive discussions were had between the Local Planning Authority and the applicant regarding an amended scheme which would sufficiently address the design issues identified.
- ② As part of the amended proposal, the landscaping scheme comprises of cherry laurel hedges, an evergreen shrub which at its ultimate height would serve provide partial screening from the front porch extension when viewed from the highway. Further, the laurel shrubs and fruit trees would also positively contribute towards the visual amenity of the surrounding street scene, an area which has seen considerable reduction of trees and shrubbery in recent years.
- ② It is noted that whilst the constructed block walls appears uncharacteristic within the street scene and would not be acceptable in isolation, amendments have been accepted to apply brick slips as a surface finish, which would appear more sympathetic with the predominantly redbrick appearance of the locality. The proposed soft landscaping would also soften the visual impact of the boundary walls on the immediate street scene.
- ② The proposed black steel fencing is of a simple and lightweight design which would constitute acceptable use of materiality.
- ② Regardless, suitable specifications and materials of the boundary treatments can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ② Given the specific site context, the amended proposed landscaping scheme would satisfactorily mitigate the visual harm caused by the front porch extension. The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ② Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for*

neighbouring occupiers.” In particular, Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

- ☐ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
- ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ For the purposes of this assessment, the maximum standards stated in Section 5.5 of the SPD also applies to single-storey front extensions.
- ☐ The front porch extension projects 1.36m along the common boundary from the front elevation of adjoined no. 41 and projects 1.85m along the common boundary from the front elevation of adjacent no. 37. As such, it is considered the proposed front porch does not result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The proposed boundary treatments, particularly along the south-east curtilage boundary, comprises a height of 1m and is not considered result in adverse levels of overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the front habitable room windows of adjoined no. 41.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout is retained.
- ☐ The proposal does not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ☐ The proposals do not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property, therefore the parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 25/07/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – received 25/07/2023

- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 1 dated 06/2022
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Landscaping Details – Drawing No. 2 Rev. 4 dated 12/10/2023

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of boundary fences, walls and gate have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved structures have been erected in accordance with the approved details. The structures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The landscaping works shown on the approved plans “Proposed Plans and Elevations Sheet 2 Rev 4 received 12/10/2023” shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with any timing / phasing arrangements approved or within the first planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

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.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	25/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	27/10/2023	Signed: RG