



Late Observations Sheet
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
03 July 2014 at 7.00 pm

Late Observations

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

3 July 2014

LATE OBSERVATION SHEET

4.1 SE/14/00493/HOUSE 22 St Botolphs Avenue, Sevenoaks TN13 3AL

The applicant has raised concerns that the appraisal refers to dormers rather than just the single bathroom dormer in the south elevation they have sought consent for. However the dormers are very much linked, both internally & externally, as well as being constructed at the same time. Although I do acknowledge that a dormer in the south elevation could be classed as permitted development.

In places my report refers to dormers and in order to reflect this fallback permitted development position, my report should just refer to a single dormer in the east elevation (bathroom) which is subject to this planning application. I have made the subsequent amendments to the following paragraphs in my report for completeness to avoid any possible confusion. The changes to the text are shown in bold.

1. This is a retrospective planning application to retain a flat roof **dormer** on the front eastern roof slope of an end of terraced property. **The dormer provides a bathroom on the second floor of the property.**
2. The **dormer includes window** in the south elevation, as well as a window in the east elevation, which will be obscured glazed.
3. The cheeks of the **dormer** have been finished in dark brown vertical hanging tiles.
4. The application follows enforcement investigations and a refused Lawful Development Certificate application to retain the **dormer**, as the works required planning permission.
12. **SE/13/02001/LDCEX** Extension and conversion of attic into bedroom and bathroom with rooflight and window to East elevation and dormer to South Elevation, part removal of chimney stack on East elevation. Refused on the 18th September 2014. Appeal pending
SE/13/02002/LDCPR: Proposed loft conversion with dormer either side of main roof, removal of part of chimney stacks. Refused on the 9th September 2013.

SE/97/02124/HIST: Formation of hard standing for parking in existing garden area. Approved on the 9th December 1997.
20. As such these policies require that new development to be in harmony with the locality. The large box **dormer** on the property **is** not in keeping with the simple and clearly defined character of the existing building or indeed the street scene. **It is noted that the dormer in the south elevation is permitted development. The dormer in the east elevation only compounds the harm as it dormer is highly visible from the street. The dormer** quite clearly creates the appearance of an extra

Agenda Item

storey to the detriment of the character of the existing dwelling and local area and as such is contrary to the above policies.

22. The flat roofed box **dormer is** extremely large and **actually extends 0.5m above the height of the former roof and to within 0.3m** of the eaves line. **The dormer completely dominates the former roof that front of the house. The dormer is** entirely disproportionate and significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the original end of terrace Edwardian property, as well of the wider visual amenity of the locality. **The former front roof is completely lost under the dormer, as a large flat roofed box just sits in place, which is taller than the original eastern roof.**
25. Given the location of the dwelling on the corner of St Botolphs Avenue, the **dormer is** very prominent within the street scene. **Its** scale dominates the roof and the once simple roof line, which is highlighted in the SRCAA has been completely lost, to the detriment of the character of the local area in such a prominent position.
26. It should also be noted that the SRCAA states the palette materials in this location is red brick, render or original roof tiles. None of these materials have been used on the **dormer** as constructed, as brown vertical hanging tiles have been used. **However other rear dormers within the street have used similar materials.**
27. Reference has been made to dormers that have been approved within the street scene, for example at No's 13 and 10 St Botolphs Avenue, both of which were permitted development as single rear dormers and not visible the street. A further single dormer was approved at No.5, but again this was a rear dormer which was not readily visible from the street or public vantage points. None of these cases are comparable as to their location or visual presence within the street. Nor were they of the size or scale, as just single dormers, rather than the double dormers that have been erected at 22 St Botolphs Avenue. **Whilst it is acknowledged that a dormer in the south elevation could be permitted development, the dormer in the eastern elevation results in the virtual loss of any of the original roof form and a very clearly creates an extra storey to the detriment of the visual amenity of the locality.**
28. Therefore it is quite apparent that the eastern dormer does not comply with saved policies EN1 & H6B of the Saved SDLP, the Residential Extensions SPD and the Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment.
30. Given the position of the **dormer** in the roof they will not result in the loss of any background daylight, sunlight or outlook to neighbouring properties.
32. **The dormer has a window in the south elevation of the bathroom** which will look onto the flank wall of 23 St Botolphs Avenue. There are no windows habitable rooms on the neighbours flank wall, so there will be no direct inter-looking between the two properties.
33. I do have concerns that this dormer will overlook the private amenity space of No.23 St Botolphs Avenue, which is defined as the 5m closest to the rear elevation of the property. Whilst the **dormer** will clearly overlook this private garden area, I acknowledge that the existing first floor windows in the south elevation already overlook this private area and are marginally closer. So even though there will be **a further window** overlooking the private garden area, on balance given this garden is

already overlooked, it is not considered that the dormer will not result in a significantly greater harm to the privacy of 23 St Botolphs Avenue than the existing situation.

34. **The development does not result in the creation of an additional bedroom and therefore there are no highway implications.** In light of the above considerations and the main papers, I still consider that the flat roof dormer has resulted in significant harm to the streetscene and is quite clearly contrary to Development Plan policies and SPD guides to handling roof extensions. Therefore the application should be refused.

Recommendation Remains Unchanged

This page is intentionally left blank