

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS
AMENDED BY THE PLANNING AND
COMPENSATION ACT 1991)**

APPEAL BY MR S & MR V PATEL

SITE AT 16 HIGH STREET NORTHWOOD

Proposed single storey rear extension to existing restaurant (Use Class A3/E(b)), demolition of existing rear outbuilding, alteration to rear flower store/workshop (Use Class E(g)(iii)) and proposed additional first floor to rear for residential use (Use Class C3)

REPLY TO LPA STATEMENT

Appellants	- Mr S PATEL
Architect	- HRP Architects Ltd

**Planning Inspectorate Ref :
A P P / R 5 5 1 0 / W / 2 1 / 3 2 8 4 6 2 7 : 1 6 H i g h S t r e e t ,
H A 6 1 B N**

Appellants comments on LPA's Appeal Statement:

- We note that the LPA have commented that the proposed building 'appears' to measure 1m higher than that of the two storey building at no. 20. This needs clarity in regard how this information is obtained as 'appears' is a very generic statement, and our drawing show the centre part of the proposed development being 560mm higher (at the ridge).
- The proposed building is the same as the building (which again we note has not received planning) in regard a two storey structure, so there should be very little in height difference and should this have been a concern can easily of been amended but there is very little difference and not enough of a reason to grant a refusal.
- A conversation we had as in our statement with one planning officer was in regard the development at no. 20 which was not acknowledged, and indeed stating on the phone as 'if it's been built its too late', is a frustrating statement for our client who has spent monies on two pre-applications and a full application. If site photos have been obtained from an officer's site visit as stated we would like to see these.
- Adjacent the building at no. 20 is a much bigger, and higher industrial unit in-situ so we do not agree with the statement our proposal has a harmful impact on the neighbouring amenity and heritage area. If anything this is a vast improvement in aesthetics and tidying up the rear amenity of the existing address which we trust would be encouraged.
- We acknowledge the statement that 'a cross-section' of the rear services yard including the structure to the North' should be included, and we would of course have provided this information if requested to do so during the application process to ensure support of the LPA but were not requested to do so.
- We trust that with the inclusion of the conditions suggested by the LPA that the appeal be allowed.