

Application Number:	23/00418/HOUS
Location:	39 Canon Street Rochdale OL16 2TF
Proposal:	Single storey front porch - retrospective
Applicant:	Kamal Ali
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

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 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 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 approx. 1.85m, with a ridge height of approx. 3.32m and a height to eaves of approx. 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.

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

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

N/A

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.*”
- ❑ Moreover, Paragraph 134 states “*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.*”
- ❑ 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.*”
- ❑ 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.
- ❑ The front porch extension constitutes a substantial and disproportionate enlargement to the host dwelling by virtue of its excessive width and height. This is exacerbated by its prominence in the junction of Canon Street and Bishop Street which further increases its obtrusiveness within the street scene. It is also considered the dual-pitched roof form of the porch relates poorly to the existing proportions and built forms and does not appear in keeping nor complementary to the host dwelling.
- ❑ It is noted that adjacent nos. 16, 18, 26 and 28 Canon Street comprises of front porch extensions. However, these porches are of a lean-to roof form which when compared with the proposed development, is not considered to significantly detract from the flat-roof form of the existing front porches.
- ❑ It is also noted that front porch extensions of a gabled-fronted roof form have been constructed elsewhere in adjacent no. 33 Canon Street and nos. 21, 23 and 25 Bishop Street. However, these works do not benefit from planning permission and therefore carries limited weight on the determination of this application.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of design and constitutes adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ 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.”*
- ❑ 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).”*
- ❑ It is noted that although the above guidance generally relates to single-storey rear extensions, it can also be applied to projections to the front of the dwelling and is assessed as such below.
- ❑ The front porch extension projects 1.36m along the common boundary from the front elevation of adjoined no. 41 and projects approx. 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 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 front porch extension does 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: Refuse

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.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ② Location Plan – dated 18/04/2017
- ② Existing Site Plan – received 20/04/2023
- ② Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 1 dated 06/2022

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/06/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	27/06/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen