



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/D/20/3263807

Mariners Lodge, Old London Road, Knockholt, Sevenoaks, Kent TN14 7JW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Richard and Suzanne Paige against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02302/HOUSE, dated 11 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing two-storey rear extension, formation of new two-storey rear extension with roof lights, alterations to the existing rear facing dormer windows, associated internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing two-storey rear extension, formation of new two-storey rear extension with roof lights, alterations to the existing rear facing dormer windows, associated internal and external alterations, at Mariners Lodge, Old London Road, Knockholt, Sevenoaks, Kent TN14 7JW, in accordance with the terms of application ref: 20/02302/HOUSE dated 11 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) This permission shall be begun before three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall relate to the following approved plans: 1827.01 (existing location plan and proposed block plan), 1827.02 (existing site plan), 1827.03A (existing floor plans and roof plan), 1827.06A (floor area calculations), 1827.07A (additional information requested by planning validation team) and 1827.10C (proposed floor plans, roof plan and elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the development shall be those indicated on the approved plans, samples / details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.
 - 4) Prior to the first use of the extension hereby permitted, details of ecological enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.

Main Issue

2. The site is located in the Green Belt. However, the parties agree that the proposal would not be inappropriate development given that it would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the limits set within Policy GB1 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan (2015) (ADMP).
3. Therefore, the main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling on the appeal site is a large, detached property of traditional appearance. It has a symmetrical front elevation with central arched entrance doorway reached via a small flight of steps with large bay windows either side and three sash windows at first floor level. It has basement and roof level accommodation and an existing two storey rear extension. The whole property has painted rendered elevations. The dwelling sits in the north west corner of a large plot on the eastern edge of the village and stands out as a relatively distinct building within this part of Old London Road where neighbouring dwellings display a variety of size, design and character.
5. The proposed extension would be of contemporary design being of part rendered, part glazed elevations with flat roof, extending across the whole width of the rear of the dwelling. It would have a central large rooflight providing light to a two-storey void beneath. The existing pitched roof dormers within the rear roofslope would be replaced by a single large flat roofed 'box' dormer with metal cladding to sides and standing seam metal roof.
6. The design of the proposed extension would contrast with the host property in terms of its built form and detailed design, representing a modern approach to the proposed extended living accommodation. However, it is my view that it would, nevertheless, be a complementary addition. The external render would reflect the elevations of the main house and whilst proportionately the elevations would contain more glazing than the host property, I note that this would enable views across the extensive and attractive garden to the south of the dwelling from within it, as well as enabling views 'through' the corner elements. The use of a flat roof would contrast with the traditional hipped roof of the host dwelling, but it is well designed and, with an overall height just below the eaves level, would appear subservient and would maintain the integrity of the original dwelling which would continue to be appreciated.
7. The proposed flat roofed dormer would also be a modern interpretation but read mainly as part of the new, modern rear elevation that would be created. In this regard it would be an appropriate and suitable addition and whilst being a single large dormer, would nevertheless sit proportionately within the original roofslope.
8. In terms of the impact on the street scene and wider area, I consider that the proposed extensions and additions would not be prominent or visually intrusive, nor harmful to the overall character of the area. In approaches from the west, the top part of the rendered flank elevation of the rear extension would be visible above the roof of the garage that is located adjacent to the

dwelling but would be seen as a subservient addition with the host dwelling and its traditional features remaining evident as the dominant element. The side of the proposed new roof dormer would also be visible, but this element would be smaller than the existing roof dormer. Whilst it would be finished in a different material from the slate roof, samples of the details and colour of the proposed materials can be required by condition to ensure a satisfactory match.

9. In views from the east, I saw on site that there is a tall roadside hedge with some mature trees which effectively screen most views from this side. Part of the glazed flank elevation of the rear extension would be visible in the view available through the vehicular access to the site, but again would be screened by existing vegetation to an extent. In any event, a glimpsed view of what would be a well-designed, interesting addition to the property would not, in my opinion, be harmful.
10. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposals would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. As a result, the proposal would accord with Policy SP1 of the Sevenoaks Local Development Plan Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and ADMP Policy EN1 which seek high quality design which responds to distinctive local character and a form of development that responds to the scale, height, character and natural features of the area.
11. The proposal would also satisfy guidance in the Sevenoaks Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2009) (SPD) which advises that extensions respect the character of the existing building with careful design, are well proportioned and which allows for innovative design which responds to its positive features. Whilst flat roofed extensions are generally not considered to be acceptable, in this case I have found that it would be sympathetic to the form of the host dwelling in the context of the overall contemporary design approach adopted. The proposed dormer would also satisfy the guidance which is that they should generally be to the rear, in scale with the roof plane and set down from the ridge so as to not dominate or detract from the characteristic roof profile of the host dwelling.
12. I consider that the proposal would also comply with the Framework, in particular paragraph 127 which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusions

13. I conclude for the above reasons that the proposal would be acceptable. Conditions to relate to the approved plans, to require samples of the materials to be used and to secure ecological enhancements are necessary in the interests of proper planning, visual amenity and to secure biodiversity net gains.
14. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR