

The Schedule of Reasons for refusal of planning permission alleges that the development in question is contrary to Planning Policies BE 13 and BE 19 ("New development must harmonize with the existing street scene" and "New development must improve or compliment the character of the area"). The street scene in Camden Avenue, if not the entire Brookside Estate has no harmonization of any sorts regarding porches or extensions. This is clearly evidential by just looking around Camden Avenue and the Brookside estate and requires no further evidence.

In respect of the size of the extension I cite below six separate housing extensions in the local vicinity which are either exactly the same or similar in terms of extensions. I draw your attention to the properties at the following local locations:

a/ 68 Brookside Road, Hayes UB4 0PW - the location is some 250 m, NE of our home and has exactly the same tiled mono-pitch roof and single storey side extension (see attached Appendix A)

b/ 63 Brookside Road, Hayes UB4 0PW - location is some 180m , NE of our home and has a mono-pitched roof to the front porch entrance and a two storey extension to the side of the semi-detached property with mono-pitch to the front of the property dividing the ground floor and first floor (see attached Appendix B)

c/ 27 Berwick Avenue, Hayes UB4 0PW - location is some 175m , NE of our home and is the adjacent street from our location . This terraces property has a mono-pitched roof to the front porch entrance (see attached Appendix C)

d/ 19 Brookside Road –location is 150. NE of our home same extension and roof works (see attached Appendix D)

e,/ 49 Brookside Road – location is 160m of our home and mono-pitched roof to the front porch entrance and a side extension to the side of the semi-detached property (Appendix E)

f/ 19 Camden Ave – location 60m from our home on the same street and same kind of extension. (Appendix F)

Therefore the reasoning to your rejection notice making reference to the works being " incongruous and fails to respect the architectural integrity of the host dwelling or visual amenity of the street scene and character of the wider area " is a poor and unsustained point of argument because clearly there are three built examples within the location having similar if not exactly the same proportions and external treatment to suit the local character and the host dwelling.

We hope that you will look favorably into reviewing the matter and grant us retrospective planning permission as we have shown local neighboring, multiple

evidence that strongly and without prejudice supports our submission. This application has already caused us great anxiety and we would be glad to discuss this matter further. We look forward to hearing from you.