



THE GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP Ltd

CHARTERED ARCHITECTS & TOWN PLANNING CONSULTANTS

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) SECTION 78

SITE AT 31 ST EDMUNDS AVENUE, RUISLIP, MIDDLESEX HA4 7XW

PLANNING APPEAL ON BEHALF OF MR KAROL SIENIUC

LPA REF.: 58245/APP/2021/4066

GMP REF.: 317XW/KS/2021/JG

**RESPONSE TO
LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON'S APPEAL STATEMENT**

SEPTEMBER 2022

I would like to make the following comments on the London Borough of Hillingdon's appeal statement (undated).

1.2 The statement refers to refusal of planning permission. This is incorrect as the application made to the LPA was for a certificate of lawfulness.

2.4 The statement refers to the outbuilding being necessarily subordinate to the use of the house. I do not think this is a requirement; rather the use should be incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house. Nevertheless I do believe that the use is subordinate.

2.5 The statement refers to lack of clarity concerning the proposed use of the outbuilding. I have inspected the plans which clearly show the proposed uses. I infer from the statement that had additional information been provided that the local authority may have taken a different decision and approved our lawful use application. I will take instructions from our client and consider a resubmission on this basis.

2.7 The statement suggests that the application at number 3 St. Edmunds Avenue was considered differently to our client's application as it was an application for planning permission. I think this is misleading as surely an application for planning permission would be scrutinised more thoroughly by the local authority.

2.10 The Council dispute the measurement taken on site of 2.5 meters. It is clear from the photographs that I submitted that there is an area of concrete adjacent to the drainage gully that is 2.5 meters down from the eaves. This concrete level is repeated on the other side of the gate and it is clear that this is the natural ground level of the adjoining garden. Unfortunately I was not able to take a photograph on this side of our client's outbuilding as no access was available to the adjoining garden. Nevertheless, I would suggest that a discrepancy of 30 mm is in itself de minimis and I will leave it to the Inspector to make his own judgments on this.

I trust you will take these comments into account when determining the client's appeal.

Mr Jeffrey Gillett, R.I.B.A.