

From: steveadamsarc@aol.com [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 January 2016 13:21
To: Young, Tony
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Householder application - 2015/6381/P - 86 Constantine Road

[REDACTED]

Dear Tom

As a matter of fact, I belatedly made comments on the website this morning on this application. We do object strongly to the scheme and for the overall reason that it does not follow CA design guidelines at all. I agree with all that you have written and am pleased that you agree that the non-compliant neighbouring dormer does not mean that another poor example should be accepted. The old CA SPG was very useful for this.

Yes, there have been several recent approvals that at best stretch the point on rear dormers but am very glad that you see this as a case worth refusing. It might either dissuade others from emulating such design or from the basis for a good benchmark for acceptability if the applicant were to revise their scheme along better lines. A rear dormer, centrally placed on the rear pitch $\frac{1}{2}$ the roof height, $\frac{1}{3}$ up from the gutter and $\frac{1}{6}$ down from the ridge with traditional windows would be far better. The whole principle of roof door access is a bit ugly.