

Please find attached the amended drawings in response to the the letter dated 19th January 2015 as well as the reasons for these amendments, described below and according to the mentioned letter:

The decision was for REFUSAL for the following reasons:

01

"The proposed two storey rear extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk, excessive depth, height and proximity to the adjoining dwelling at 69 High Road, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, by reason of loss of light, loss of outlook, overshadowing and over dominance."

We changed this extension/ layout. The proposed 1st floor extension is smaller in scale and depth. You can now see the 45 degree line from the neighbouring property and the new extension is set back to the limits of this line. With this solution we believe there is no loss of light, loss of outlook, overshadowing and over dominance (*Any extensions at first floor level should not extend beyond a 45-degree line of sight taken from the nearest first floor habitable room window of the neighbouring property."*)

02

"The proposed first floor side and rear extensions by reason of their size, bulk and design would fail to appear as subordinate additions and would result in the complete over development of the site and have an unacceptable impact to the character of the original property and the visual amenity of the surrounding area"

We changed the drawings accordingly. We are not extending to the side elevation any more and the extension at the back is appear as a subordinate addition to the existing building. We believe there is no over-dominance

03

"Single storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses should not exceed 3.6m in depth and should have a maximum height of 3m for a flat roof or 3.4m for a pitched roof. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of 5m and flat roof height of 2.8m which is contrary to the above guidance. However, the height and depth would match the existing single storey extension of the adjoining property at No.69 and is therefore considered acceptable in this instance."

04

"The proposed side extension by reason of its size, design, projection beyond the existing side elevation, creation of a crown roof profile and visibility from the public highway would create a discordant and incongruous addition that would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings"

There is no side extension any more so there are no visible changes on the main elevation

05

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms and those altered by the proposals would maintain an adequate

outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.

06

Following the construction of the rear extension approximately square metres of private amenity space would be retained for the occupiers of the dwelling which is in accordance with Paragraph 4.9 of the HDAS guidance and Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan:

07

The proposed extension is considered to not materially increase the parking demand for the occupiers of the site.