

Email 30 th October 2023

Further to the decision notice we are again confused by the decision. The revised proposals had a reduced ridge line and set back at first floor. I fail to see why this application is being assessed differently from others approved on the same estate.

Whilst we do not wish to waste ours and the council's time on a further appeal, we will if required.

To avoid this we are prepared to reduce the roof line further and to push the front face of the first floor addition further back. This ensures the streetscene is unaffected by the proposals being subservient to the house. The width of proposals seek no increase on the existing.

I would welcome your informal comment on the revised drawings attached, so I can advise the applicant on how best to proceed.

Attached are others approved by the council on the same estate. for reference

I look forward to and thank you in anticipation of your assistance in this matter.

- 29 Hawkswood Avenue - 20/1163/PMR - Extended at first floor to boundary.
- 31 Hawkswood Avenue – also recently extended to boundary at first floor
- 3 Croft Way – side extension 1 m from boundary at first floor. Also the extended house is ~12 m wide.
- 35 Trenton Close – a first floor extension granted **this year**, to the boundary
- Examples also attached for reference

Regards

James TEMPLEMAN