

Brief statement in respect of retrospective application in relation to single storey rear extension at

36 Claymere Avenue,

OL11 5WB.

Introduction.

A.J.Cocker Associates are instructed to prepare a retrospective planning application in relation to the above. A similar proposal, with a pitched roof giving a greater height adjacent to the existing house, was approved as a 'larger home extension' under reference 22/00304/HH42.

Extension as constructed.

During construction an error in setting out was made and the measurement for the projection beyond the rear elevation of the house was taken as an internal rather than an external measurement. This has resulted in the extension being slightly deeper, but only by the width of the cavity wall, some 300mm. In addition, during construction it became evident that a flat roof solution would be a better option given the difficulties in achieving the correct roof pitch and securing appropriate roofing tiles. In addition, it was clear that a flat roof option would be less intrusive than the approved pitch roof as, generally, the height of the extension would be reduced.

When the roofing joists were delivered to site in standard lengths, it was decided that wastage could be avoided by not cutting the joists and an overhang to the extension could be created. The purpose of the overhang would be to protect the large bifolding doors and create a little sheltered external space immediately outside the doors. It was considered that this overhang would not cause an intrusion on neighbouring properties as the height at the eaves, measuring 2.95m, falls within the criteria of Permitted Development. Further the technical guidance specifically states that any overhangs are discounted for measurement of the eave's height when within 2m of the boundary. This specifically applies the adjoining property, number 38 Claymere Avenue. However, this property already has a single storey rear extension along the boundary which minimises any adverse effect the applicant's extension might have on this property. Whereas the property on the other side, number 34, is set at an angle such that any effect the applicant's extension might have on that property diminishes as you move further away from the rear elevation of the original house.

Conclusion.

The applicant accepts that the extension as constructed varies slightly from the originally approved scheme and understands the necessity to regularise the situation with a retrospective application. However, the changes made during construction were carefully considered and it was felt that the amendments would have no greater impact on the neighbouring properties than the scheme which was approved. In fact, the extension as constructed has a lesser impact by virtue of its reduced height. We would therefore hope that the council will feel able to support this application.