

Impact on amenities

No. 6

The rear extension would project 5 metres from the rear wall of number 6 and would be located directly adjacent to the common boundary between the two properties, it would be below the level of the closest window which serves the kitchen area and is set back approx. 1m from the shared boundary.

The proposed extension is a single storey structure with a flat roof, and due to its configuration of the house at number 8 and the distance of other windows to potentially habitable rooms from the extension, whilst it will be visible in oblique views from the lower windows of the adjoining property, **the impact would not be significant in terms of an overbearing effect and the extension** will not obstruct the outlook from the rear windows to any material extent.

The Council states that the extension results in harmful loss of daylight. This is a rule of thumb as opposed to a test that is used to determine whether more detailed day lighting studies are required and is not, of itself, determinative of harm. The proposal would not result in any greater impact in terms of loss of light than currently experienced by the existing rear extension, therefore it is our opinion that it would be unreasonable to warrant a refusal on the loss of light.

There are no windows in the side elevation of the extension facing the neighbouring property and consequently, it does not result in any loss of privacy or overlooking. I note that there have been no representations received from the neighbouring occupiers.

The extension is not visible from the street, it is screened by other houses and I am mindful that the proposed extension replaces an existing extension, which would also be visible from the first floor windows of houses on Yeading Gardens. It will be in line with the adjoining property no. 4.

The site is not listed, nor within a conservation area. The context is one of varied architectural styles and extensions to other houses on the area vary in height and form. Within this context the extension does not appear as incongruous or over-dominant.

The neighbouring property No. 8 has a marquee in the rear garden from March till November every year. It can be seen in the attached photographs. The marquee will be classed as a permanent structure as it is pinned to the ground, non-movable and is erected for over 28 days. It extends further than 6 metres from the rear wall of the original house of no. 4. The existing extension of appeal site (no. 6) is 3 m. As the marquee extends further by another 3 metres and on the other side the extension of no. 4 extends by another 2 metres, it is blocking the light of no. 6.

Based on the above justification we kindly request that the appeal be allowed for the single storey rear extension.