



Planning Appeals <planningappeals@hillingdon.gov.uk>

APP/R5510/D/16/3165520

1 message

sumit sharma <sumits1982@hotmail.com>

16 December 2016 at 14:58

To: "planningappeals@hillingdon.gov.uk" <planningappeals@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Hello,

I have been advised to email the two attachments '01 APPEAL FORM' and 'APPEAL PERSONAL' to this address. I have had technical problems in submitting the Appeal through the Appeals Portal and was advised by their tech support to email the main body of text and attachments to them. I have also included that text here for your info (below) and additional attachments (11,12,13,14 and A1 and A2) to support the appeal

My appeal is based on the fact our architect (Mr Stasch) the acting agent at the time of submission, had intentionally submitted a different set of drawing plans to that agreed without consent. He was informed officially by hillingdon civic centre Planning Officer John Allum the plans he eventually submitted were not fit for submission, whilst failing to submit the newer plans that were deemed suitable for submission by Mr Allum.

Mr Stasch, our architect choose to ignore all advice and to disregard the new approved plans because he thought the extended eaves of the new plan would encroach on the boundary of the neighbouring party wall, this despite numerous explanations in writing and otherwise from myself and Mr Allum explaining the wall is jointly owned with the boundary line going through the middle, thus enabling the eaves to be extended to this point. As shown in the email thread below, Mr Stasch initially acknowledged the point and made suitable amendments to the written approval of Mr Allum. The application was made entirely by Mr Stasch and he failed to communicate in writing or otherwise his intention of submitting the older (wrong) set of drawings, in fact at no point did he mention he had done this. I only became aware he had done this soon after the refusal.

Mr Stasch submitted the older design as the (unconventional) eaves drop did not hang over the party wall, whereas the newer approved (conventional) design did hang over the party wall (although as mentioned it was explained to him this was not an issue).

I hope there is scope to include the new attached drawings (11,12,13 and 14) that should have been submitted initially. If there is, in my opinion the revised design is a significant improvement on previous iterations as it includes a conventional eaves design, matching that of 2 and 3 Birchway respectively. I also believe when compared to a hip to gable dormer loft conversion (for which approval has been granted) the new/ correct drawings of the proposed side extension in question better preserves the symmetry of the adjoining dwelling at No. 3 and character of the street scene, though this of course is entirely subjective.

The roof design includes a flat 'crown' area, which I understand can be deemed unsightly in general. In this case however, the visual impact of this design would be minimal in my opinion due to the Sainsbury's Local to the west, which largely obscures the view of the roof from Coldharbour Lane and when entering Birchway.

Please see below for an email thread showing how Mr Allum offered feedback on a drawing that was unsuitable by virtue of its unconventional eaves design (attachment A1), and Mr Stasch replying with an amended design which was considered suitable for submission by Mr Allum (attachment A2). Please note how attachment A2 was not submitted in the application, and how an older unsuitable design was submitted by Mr Stasch contrary to all advice and without consent.

From: John Allum
Sent: 01 February 2016 14:38
To: sumit sharma
Cc: stasch@btinternet.com
Subject: Re: 1 Birchway Drawings Revision

[NOTE TO OFFICER DEALING WITH THIS APPEAL -please see attachment A1 which is included as part of this appeal to see the original document attached to this email]

Dear Mr Stasch & Mr Sharma

Mrs Sharma has just been to see me and to discuss the amended plans.

The amended floor plan drawing no:8 now shows all rooms with descriptions, this is fine.

I still have a concern regarding the front and rear elevations, drawings nos:11 (front) and 12 (rear). The amended eaves detail is slightly different from the last refused application but still in principle shows an inset gutter located on top of the extension wall. This was seen as an unacceptable design feature in the previous application ref. 53788/APP/2014/562 (Inspector's decision attached) and my concern is that this scheme still proposes a similar feature which does not overcome the reason for refusal.

Mrs Sharma has stated to me that there is an existing gap of about 9 inches between the existing ground floor extension and the boundary wall and that the wall is in shared ownership, with the boundary line running down its' centre. If this is the case, is it possible to increase the roof width slightly to incorporate more of an eaves feature to overcome the objection and still not encroach on the adjoining Sainsbury's site? If this can be incorporated, the design should be acceptable.

At present I am not certain the latest amended plans dated 30.12.15 are sufficient to overcome our previous objection and I feel a further amendment is required.

Regards

John Allum

On 16 February 2016 at 17:56, Pawel Stasch <stasch@btinternet.com> wrote:

[NOTE TO OFFICER DEALING WITH THIS APPEAL -please see attachment A2 which is included as part of this appeal to see the original document attached to this email]

Dear Mr. John Allum

In the attachment revised drawings

I hope the revisions will meet with your expectations

Please let me know if all is fine now

Kind regards

Pawel Stasch

Architect Agent

Wed 09/03, 15:58

You;

Pawel Stasch (stasch@btinternet.com)

Inbox

[NOTE TO OFFICER DEALING WITH THIS APPEAL - John Allum is referring to attachment A2]

Dear Mr Stasch

I refer to your phone call of 29 February and apologise for the delay in replying.

The amended plans sent with your email of 16 February show a roof/eaves form in keeping with the original house and our design guidance and this should overcome the reason for refusal on application ref. 53788/APP/2014/562 dated 23-04-2014 (appeal dismissed 16-03-2015). The Inspector commented "I consider the unconventional eaves design would not match either the eaves detail at No 1 or the adjoining house at No 3. It would therefore unduly detract from the balanced and symmetrical appearance of this pair of dwellings." The amended scheme includes a conventional eaves design and therefore should be acceptable.

The second reason for refusal regarding amenity (garden) space still needs to be overcome, the applicant has confirmed in conversation with me that the existing outbuilding will be altered to allow for more space.

I hope this is of help.

Regards

John Allum

Thank You

Sumit Sharma

8 attachments



01 APPEAL FORM - 167136 (1).pdf
94K



APPEAL PERSONAL - 167136.pdf
44K



11%2c.%2c.1 Birchway Hayes UB3 3PA-Model.pdf
1122K



12%2c.%2c.1 Birchway Hayes UB3 3PA-Model.pdf
2143K



13.%2c.%2c1 Birchway Hayes UB3 3PA-Model.pdf
1133K



14%2c.%2c.1 Birchway Hayes UB3 3PA-Model.pdf
1119K



A1.pdf
1129K



A2.pdf
1130K