

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed side extension, by reason of its width and location would infill the existing gap appearing discordant and incongruous in the street scene, failing to respect the original form and layout of the street scape, adding an unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the host building and character of the area”

Grounds for appeal and reasons in support:

1. As seen in drawing No 3, the side extension would preserve a gap of 3.4m at the first-floor level and a partial element at the ground-floor extension could be built under permitted development.
2. The extension would not entirely close the ‘gap’ and in fairness and on balance the neighbours at No 18 have built a two-storey structure near to the boundary.
3. The side extension has no impact on No 18 as they have constructed near the boundary and is a blank gable elevation.
4. The side extension is for a garage to secure the car on a night due and is not habitable.
5. There are other mitigation examples of larger extensions on St Marys Avenue that have constructed on the boundary line, refer to
15 St Marys Avenue - 2013/62/91244/E
22 St Marys Avenue - 2019/62/90897/E
16 St Marys Avenue - 2006/62/91583/E1
6. The side extension is minimal in massing and therefore, we disagree with the council and would not result in harm to the character of the host property and the street scene.