

These Notes are our grounds for appeal as the Planning Authority and the Case Officer in particular have not dealt with the application in a fair and accurate Manner. Which includes no Site visit / No discussion on changes to the design – Suggests he needed an Arboreal report (That was never asked for) they totally mismanaged the Application

I list below the issues that we wish to be raised with the Appeal Inspector as our grounds for an APPEAL

I take the items one at a time and list the line detail from the REFUSAL notice document in Black and the reason for the APPEAL in Red

The extension by virtue of its bulk and depth would amount to overdevelopment of the site and would be contrary to the guidance contained within the Council's Design Guide SPD.
Not specified and the rules are you can develop up to 50% of the property's curtilage. If the Case Officer had taken the time to check it, the site is 403 SQM and the proposed development including the existing Building is 108 SQM. Sqm usage on site is about 25% - How can this be described as over development !!!

The proposed extension would have a dominant, overshadowing and overbearing impact and would cause unacceptable harm to No.50 Fir Copse.

This proposal is a single storey Rear extension no more than 3.2 High in a dipping garden - How can that be overbearing and are nowhere near the Fir Copse The Fir copse is further down the garden

SPECIAL NOTE - THE CASE OFFICER NEVER VISITED THE SITE - BACK GATE IS ALWAYS LOCKED AND CLIENT HAS DOGS OUTSIDE

Furthermore, the rearmost window on the northern side elevation would be able to provide unacceptable levels of overlooking of No.50's rear garden area leading to a loss of privacy to this neighbouring dwelling.

This is one window to the Kitchen which if asked this window could have been FROSTED Could not be bothered to ask There is a SIX-FOOT-HIGH FENCE and Garage between no 48 & 50 so nobody could see

the proposed new extension so you could not be seen as the fence is too high. ALSO, No. 50 they never objected. They were happy with the development.

Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would safeguard offsite trees within No.46's rear curtilage and thereby could result in harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers by way of loss of soft landscaping and introduction of a large extension with an excessive depth adjacent to the site boundary resulting in urbanisation and an overbearing impact. No 46 has been empty for over a year and there foliage is many meters high and the garden of this property is not visible to any body

This is totally incorrect. The Case Officer NEVER asked for an Arboreal report - The trees at no 50 are large and overgrown - If the Case Officer had visited, he would have known We would have got an Arboreal report if that was an issue. As with no 46.

By virtue of its mass, bulk and flat roof nature the proposed extension would not be in keeping with the character of the dwelling and given the potential to be viewed from the street would be harmful to the street scene character

This is a Single storey Extension with a Flat roof - This was to keep the design less imposing to the Neighbours we would have preferred to have a Pitched roof. . How can the Case Office suggest it would be harmful to the street Scene

It could not be seen from the street if it was given permission to be built. This proves the Case Officer has not visited the site.

So, these are just a few Points but the whole refusal Statement is INCORRECT although they mention the NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK but does not name the Paragraph concerned. It is more than 230 Paragraphs This is a 76 Page document. They could not be bothered.

In addition to this list of errors it should be noted that there were no Objections from anybody to this application.

For the Inspectors information this was this applicants second attempt to apply for an extension to this property as the Family need more Bedrooms

Application Number: APP/24/00174 Site Address: 48 Fir Copse Road, Waterloo, PO7 5HZ

Proposal: One and half storey rear extension off the back of a bungalow with raised roof height REFUSED on the 7th June 2024.

Similar reasons to this application but that was a much larger extension

I hope that the Inspector can agree that this is a comprehensive list of the Planning Application not being handled correctly or in a competent manner.

Produced by Les Rosenthal the Agent

9th December 2024.