

Grounds For appeal for 65 judge heath lane ,Hillingdon, hayes, ub32pa
app.ref.no68374/app/2017/819

The house has been carefully and sympathetically extended by myself using all materials to match the existing buildings at a great expense thus greatly improving the run down building it once was, with a lot of comments from local residents on how well the house now looks.

Councils reasons for refusal:

Part 1 policies:

Pt1.BE1

Part 2 Policies:

BE13,BE15,BE19 and BE22

The proposed extension would not be subordinate it would balance out the house rather than just having a garage stuck on the side, using pebble dashing to match and having the roof profile matching the existing and using second hand tiles would not fail to harmonise with the existing design it would actually blend in and with the addition of a window to above the front door and over the garage would vastly improve the look and balance out the house and would not stand out at all fully fulfilling clause BE13,be15,be19,be19 and be22

The house is situated on a corner plot and the distance between the front of both houses is over 4.2metres which at no point could be classed as "giving a cramped form of development and result in a terracing effect" (*this measurement is unaffected by the proposed extension*)

the 1.3 metre the officer measured is to the boundary we put up to allow our neighbours to have full rear access to the back of their property ,the original boundary went half way between the houses (*neighbour has a double storey extension already*) and was no use to either of us and could have been a security issues so we moved the fence up to front of our extension then using the extension wall as the rest of the boundary.

We have access to the rear of our house through the garage which also greatly improves the security with a locked side gate on our neighbours side(if the officer had contacted us we this would of been explained) fully fulfilling clause BE13.be15,be19,be19 and be22

At no point did we want to convert the garage as the officer put in her report its our only storage area and was the purpose of the garage extension I've no idea why she made this up, we have parking for over 10 cars on the drive.

The council nor the officer ever contacted us throughout the planning permission and after the decision I phoned to see what amendments I could make and to speak to them where I was promised a call within 48hours which I was never contacted and is the reason for appeal(*have mobile phone bill as proof of calls*).

Kind Regards

Eddie Douse ACIPHE Rp