Grounds for appeal

Our planning application HGY/2016/1981 was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed roof extension by reason of its excessive size and scale would be a dominant addition out of proportion with the host building failing to achieve any material subordination to the current roof form,detrimental to the street scene and character of the area contrary to London Plan 2015 policies 7.4 and 7.6,Local Plan 2013 policy SP11, saved UDP policy UD3 and policy DM1 of the Pre-Submission Version of the Development Management DPD January 2016.

It is our case that this decision is not consistent with planning decisions previously made in the immediate neighbourhood of our property, in particular 42 Twyford Avenue (HGY/2009/0828), 40 Twyford Avenue (HGY/2015/0118) and 38 Twyford Avenue (HGY/2016/2286).

Furthermore we have attempted to make contact by phone on more than 20 occasions and in written form by e- mail on 18.08.16, 24.08.16, 02.09.16, 05.09.16, 12.09.16, 20.09.16, 23.09.16, 27.09.16, 29.09.16, 06.10.16 and 13.10.16. At no point has the council shown any willingness to consider this inconsistency. On the contrary, we were referred to new regulations which have come into force in 2016. However, planning application HGY/2016/2286 had been granted planning permission after our refusal, which is a further inconsistency.

The officer's report for our application HGY/2016/1981 reads in the section **Impact on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area:**

"Whilst there are a number of roof extensions in the street, the majority of those properties that have been extended have been done so with subordinate roof extensions. In comparison, the proposed hipped roof over the existing two storey side extension is not set down from the ridgeline and would therefore appear as a top heavy addition, dominating the roofslope and failing to be subordinate to the original building."

The officer´s report for application HGY/2016/2286 reads in the **same section**
"*The proposed first floor side extension will be positioned over the original, existing, ground-floor garage, and set back from the building line by 0.5m. The roof will be pitched and follow the line of the existing roofslope. There have been many similar alterations to the properties in this road, as such this proposal would mirror the proposal already granted permission and implemented at the neighbouring property, No. 40 Twyford Avenue (ref: HGY/2016/0119). Although visible from the street, this extension will be located in front of an existing two-storey section of the house; therefore there will not be a significant perceived increase in bulk of the dwelling or reduction in the visible separation between buildings."*

*And the officer´s report for application HGY/2015/0118 reads **again in the same section:***
"The second storey extension and associated roof form is very similar and would mirror the existing second storey extension at No 42 Twyford Avenue. Although visible from the street, this extension will be located in front of an existing two storey section of the house; therefore there will not be a significant perceived increase in bulk of the dwelling or reduction in the visible separation between buildings."

We would refer to the appended document**<planning comparison>** which provides a direct comparison of the three front elevations and thus demonstrates that the proposals are

identical. It should be noted that the proposal at 40 Twyford Avenue has already been implemented and the applicants at no 38 Twyford are in the process of implementing the proposal.

In direct comparison the planning officers for 38 & 40 Twyford Avenue state that "*therefore there will not be a significant perceived increase in bulk of the dwelling"* whilst the planning officer at no 44 Twyford Avenue states that *"by reason of its excessive size and scale would be a dominant addition out of proportion with the host building failing to achieve any material subordination to the current roof form,detrimental".* We would suggest that these statements are contradicting each other and that either planning permission should have been refused for all properties on Twyford Avenue seeking to implement the same hipped roof extension or our planning application at no 44 Twyford Avenue should have received planning consent in line with previous planning decisions by the same Local Authority.

London 17.10.2016
M. Christodoulou