

Application Number:	22/01319/HOUS
Location:	3 Wayfarers Way Wardle Rochdale OL12 9EQ
Proposal:	Alterations to roof including increase in ridge height, rear dormer extension, single-storey rear extension and insertion of 2no roof lights to front roof elevation
Applicant:	Mr Adam Ellis
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 3 Wayfarers Way, a two-storey detached dwelling located in Wardle. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 1 Wayfarers Way to the east, adjacent to no. 5 Wayfarers Way to the west, and faces the highway to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 3 Oakley Way, which is sited on a lower level than the host property. In addition, the rear elevation of the host dwelling faces properties on Joseph Lister Drive which are also sited on a lower level to Wayfarers Way.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the heightening of the ridge line of the host dwelling by approx. 1.74m to accommodate an additional bedroom in the attic. This is accompanied by the addition of a gable-fronted dormer and roof light on both the front and rear roof slope. The proposed development is characterised by a pitched roof form with a steeper pitch than the existing roof. The proposal would retain the eaves height of the host dwelling.

The application also proposes a single-storey rear extension which projects approx. 2.35m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of approx. 3.29m and an eaves height of approx. 2.54m.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received. The following concerns were raised:

- ☐ Concerns over the impact of the proposed increase of the ridge height on the privacy of the neighbouring garden;
- ☐ Concerns over the loss of light as a result of the proposed increase in ridge height; and
- ☐ Concerns over the impact of the proposals on the value of neighbouring property.

Following amendments of the proposed plans, surrounding neighbours were re-notified. One additional objection letter was received with the following concerns:

- ☐ Concerns over noise and disruptions from the proposed development;
- ☐ Concerns over precedence set by disruptions caused by previous building works at the host property;
- ☐ Concerns over loss of privacy from the proposed rear dormer;
- ☐ Concerns over loss of sunlight from the proposed increase in ridge height; and
- ☐ Safety concerns over construction materials falling into neighbouring curtilage.

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ Concerns over the overlooking and overshadowing impacts of the proposal are addressed under the 'Amenity' section of the report.
- ☐ Negative effect on the value of properties is not a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Construction works are expected to result in a level of noise and disturbance and should not be a reason to prevent development. Noise and disturbance generated in excess of what is 'acceptable' would be controlled via separate legislation through the Council's Public Protection Service.

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 following amendments were made to the proposed plans:

- ② The originally proposed flat-roofed rear dormer removed and replaced with two gable-fronted dormers;
- ② Addition of roof light on rear elevation roof and front elevation roof light repositioned;
- ② The existing front gable wall removed to match with the host pitched roof; and
- ② The ridge height of the amended proposal further reduced by approx. 0.45m.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② 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 requires 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 application proposes a gable-fronted dormer to the front and rear roof slope of the host dwelling. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes *“dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully design and sited”*. Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:
- (i) *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
 - (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
 - (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
 - (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
 - (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
 - (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style; and*
 - (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof.”*
- ❑ The proposed dormers would be set down from the ridge line and would be set back approx. 1.3m from the eaves line. The form, scale, positioning and materiality of the proposed gable-fronted dormers would be consistent with the existing dormers present in surrounding dwellings.
- ❑ Overall, the proposed dormers would comply with all points of section 5.17 of the SPD and would constitute a satisfactory standard of design.
- ❑ The proposed increase in ridge height would be prominent when viewed alongside adjacent dwellings in its immediate vicinity. However, given the character of the wider street scene, which comprises of dwellings of differing scales and heights, and the fact the proposed ridge height would not exceed the height of the tallest dwelling along the building line, it is considered the proposed development would be compatible with the character of the area and would be acceptable in this context.
- ❑ With regard to the proposed rear extension, the single-storey form would be subservient to the host dwelling and the use of a lean-to roof would also be in keeping.
- ❑ Materials of the proposed rear extension would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.

- ☐ It is considered the proposed sliding doors and roof lights are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords 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 proposed heightened roof would be sited to the north-west and north-east of the rear curtilages of adjacent no. 1 and no. 5 respectively, which would retain unrestricted access to sunlight to both rear gardens. Given this, it is considered the proposed works would not result in unacceptable overshadowing impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ As the host dwelling is sited on a higher level than its rear-facing properties, regard has also been given to section 4.1 of the SPD, which states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - ☐ *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage”*.
- ☐ Given the existing 7.93m distance between the rear elevation of the host dwelling and the rear curtilage boundary, which sits below the minimum standards, and the existing rear curtilage boundary treatments providing adequate screening from directly facing no. 55 Joseph Lister Drive, it is considered the additional amenity impacts from the proposed rear extension would be acceptable.
- ☐ 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 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ☐ *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 0.69m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 1 and approx. 2.06m from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 5, in accordance with the maximum standards for detached properties.
- ☐ Additionally, section 5.17 of the SPD states *“dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD].”*
- ☐ Given the modest scale of the proposed dormers, which would have limited overlooking impacts relative to standard-sized habitable room windows, and the proposed dormers being sufficiently set back from the eaves line, on

balance, it is considered the overlooking impacts to the adjacent properties would be acceptable.

- ☐ The plans confirm the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ 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 proposals would increase the number of bedrooms from four to five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed development would retain two existing parking spaces in the front driveway, therefore the proposed 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 – Drawing No. (60)-01
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. (60)-02 Revision B
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. HC-22519-(20)-01
- ☐ Existing Elevations and Roof Section – Drawing No. HC-22519-(20)-02
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. HC-22519-(20)-03 Revision A
- ☐ Proposed Elevations and Roof Section – Drawing No. HC-22519-(20)-04 Revision C
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Street Scene Drawings – Drawing No. HC-22519-(20)-05 Revision A

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. 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.

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	09/02/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	09/02/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen