

Application Number:	22/01581/HOUS
Location:	13 Shore Road Littleborough Rochdale OL15 9LG
Proposal:	Extension of existing driveway including retaining wall/boundary treatments and alterations to existing front porch fenestrations
Applicant:	Charlotte Hill
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. 13 Shore Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 15 Shore Road to the west, no. 11 Shore Road to the east, and faces the highway to the north, which is on an upward incline towards the north-west. The front elevation of the dwelling faces no. 28 Shore Road and Moorfield House to the north. The dwelling and its associated driveway are sited on a higher level than the highway.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following alterations to the front curtilage and front driveway of the host property:

- ☐ The extension of the front driveway for two vehicles constructed from block paving with a maximum gradient of 1:6;
- ☐ The construction of a front garden space, surrounded by red brick walls and piers;

- ☐ Existing front boundary brick wall altered to accommodate additional access space;
- ☐ The installation of 1.8m-high timber slatted screens to the side of the host dwelling and on the boundary with adjacent no. 11;
- ☐ The replacement of the retaining wall to adjoined no. 15 and the addition of 1.1m-high timber slatted screen to the boundary with adjoined no. 15;
- ☐ The installation of 1.1m-high strained wire balustrade to the boundary wall with adjacent no. 11; and
- ☐ The application of grey 'Cork Sol' render to the front elevation of the bay windows.

Additionally, the application proposes alterations to the front porch which would project 1.5m from the front elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed porch is characterised by a pitched roof in lieu of the existing flat roof and has a ridge height of approx. 3.4m and an eaves height of approx. 2.78m. It is accompanied by brick steps to the front and a brick-facing retaining wall with strained wire balustrade. The proposed porch would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

18/00539/HOUS - Single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing single storey rear extension and store, removal of rear chimney and alterations to existing rear elevation - Grant subject to conditions

20/00270/HOUS - Single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing extension - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main concern regarding this application is the gradient of the proposed driveway. In order to ensure that driveways are practical and operate safely for both users of the driveway and pedestrians and vehicles on the highway it connects to, Highways would require a driveway gradients are a maximum of 1:6. The submitted cross section plan indicate a maximum gradient of 1:6 and would be acceptable.

The agent has confirmed the proposed widening of the driveway is to accommodate pedestrian access and therefore the existing vehicle crossing point would not need to be extended.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

The existing driveway sheds rainfall runoff, unattenuated, across the public footpath onto the highway. For the proposed driveway, permeability testing on site is not

necessary because the open graded gravel sub-base provides attenuation storage, giving time for water to slowly percolate into the ground.

The drainage officer requests that prior to the commencement of development, full details of a permeable driveway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Concerns were raised regarding the design of the proposed dormer, however no amendments were submitted.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ 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 nearby street scene of the host property is characterised by a mix of semi-detached, detached and terraced dwellings of red brick or stone construction. Within the immediate locality, no. 5, 7, 9, and 11 Shore Road are pairs of red brick semi-detached dwellings with modestly-sized lean-to porch canopies. The host dwelling and no. 15 differs from the adjacent dwellings in its form, massing and materiality, and comprise of design features such as roof overhangs, curved bay windows and flat-roof porches which contribute to the cohesive character of the dwellings.
- ② The proposed porch projects an additional 0.21m forward than the existing porch and has a maximum height approx. 0.8m higher than the existing. Whilst this projection is not substantial, the increase in height and overall size would constitute a more prominent and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling and adjoined no. 15. The scale of the proposed porch would also be out of keeping with the modestly sized porches in the adjacent semi-detached dwellings.
- ② In addition, the use of a pitched roof form and the relocation of the front door from the side of the porch to the front would create an asymmetric façade with no. 15 and would relate poorly with the proportions and forms of the two dwellings.
- ② Whilst the materiality of the porch roof and fenestration would match the host dwelling, the application of grey render on all elevations of the proposed porch would appear incongruous and would further detract from the character and appearance of the pair of dwellings.
- ② It is noted the proposed porch may fall within permitted development rights. However, as an application for planning permission was submitted rather than a certificate of lawfulness, the proposed plans would be subject to an assessment of its planning merits. As such, this carries little weight in the considerations of this application and the identified visual amenity harm of the proposed porch remains.
- ② Taken as a whole, the proposed porch would not comprise a satisfactory standard of design and would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ② Suitable boundary treatments, screens and retaining walls can be secured via condition as to not harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ② The proposed plans indicate storage for refuse bins to be located in a designated area to the side of the host dwelling behind timber-slatted screens which would ensure they are stored out of public view from the highway.
- ② 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.”*
- ❑ The proposals seek to extend the front porch by an additional 0.21m from the existing porch. Given the marginal projection and the approx. 17m intervening distance between the host dwelling and the curtilages of the front-facing properties, it is considered the proposed porch would not result in unacceptable amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers. It is also considered the proposed porch would retain adequate natural light into the ground-floor habitable room of the host dwelling.
- ❑ Suitable boundary treatments, screens and retaining walls can be secured via condition as to not cause adverse harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties.
- ❑ The proposal would 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 application site comprises of a driveway with an existing gradient of 1:3.5 on an upward incline from Shore Road, which also has a steep gradient. The proposed plans indicate the driveway gradient to be reduced to a maximum gradient of 1:6 which would provide a safe and satisfactory vehicular access and parking and would be acceptable.
- ❑ The proposals would retain sufficient off-street parking space for two vehicles, and would comply with the maximum standard stated in Appendix 5.
- ❑ It is acknowledged the existing driveway may shed rainfall runoff onto the public footpath and highway due to its gradient. Whilst the gradient of the proposed driveway would likely still result in rainfall runoff to some degree, it is considered the proposed block paving could provide a suitable permeable solution, subject to condition demonstrating that the necessary permeability can be achieved.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

- ❑ By virtue of its scale, massing, materiality and design, the proposed porch would represent a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the front elevation of the host dwelling which would not be in keeping with adjoined no. 15 Shore Road. As such, the proposed development does not constitute a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance and would be contrary to 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 Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

INFORMATIVES

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

- ☐ Location Plan
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. 211-001 Rev. TP01
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan with 3D Views – Drawing No. 411-001 Rev. TP01
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. 212-001 Rev. TP01
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. 412-001 Rev. TP01
- ☐ Existing First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 212-002 Rev. TP00
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 412-002 Rev. TP00
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 412-001 Rev. TP00
- ☐ Hard Landscape Plan and Section – Drawing No. 401-004 Rev. TP01

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	01/03/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	01/03/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen