

24 December 2022

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Re: **Planning Refusal 43797/APP/2022/1764** for 1a Bridge Way, Ickenham, UB10 8QR

The plans were prepared in accordance with current advice available on the internet as well as:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/830643/190910\\_Tech\\_Guide\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/830643/190910_Tech_Guide_for_publishing.pdf) (This PDF has been submitted as a supporting document '190910\_Tech\_Guide\_for\_publishing.pdf')

First of all I would like to bring to your attention that we have had misleading advice from our Contact Planning Officer at Hillingdon Council who had problems reading the scale on submitted drawings and said 'They comply either way however the measurements I have taken are considerably smaller than what is annotated on the proposed plan and it would be great if you client could get the most space possible under PD.' (Email copy is submitted as evidence 'Email from Contact Planning Officer on 09-08-22'). This advice has suggested that PD would be granted, and we did redo the drawings to get the maximum as advised.

Secondly Hillingdon Council asked for an initial extension until 16/08/22 which, we agreed to but then they did not get back to us with a decision until 03/10/22. We contacted the Contact Planning Officer by email on 17/08/22 to ask for a decision, by phone to the planning team on 24/08/22 (who took a message for our officer) and then we finally made a complaint on 16/09/22 and the decision was given as the outcome. This caused us unnecessary stress.

1 The proposed development does not constitute permitted development...because the proposed single storey side extension would extend beyond a wall which fronts a highway...


**Response:** There is a significant intervening area of land (consisting of hedge row and a separate wire fence) in different ownership between the boundary of the curtilage of the house and the highway.

The advice we followed was '(ii) the distance between the house and the highway - in cases where that distance is substantial, it is unlikely that a building can be said to front the highway. The same may be true where there is a significant intervening area of land in different ownership or use between the boundary of the curtilage of the house concerned and the highway' (**page 16, 190910\_Tech\_Guide\_for\_publishing.pdf**)

2 The proposed development does not constitute permitted development because the submitted drawings are not to scale...and eaves height would not exceed 3 metres.

**Response:** The drawings are to scale. When the scale bar is used for calibration then accurate measurements can be made. As such it meets the requirements under paragraph A.1(i), Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2, Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Perhaps this was not realised by the Apprentice Contact Planning Officer due to inexperience. The eaves height does not exceed 3 metres.

The scale bar calibration was demonstrated by us, and this was emailed to the Contact Planning Officer on 17/08/22:



3 The proposed development does not constitute permitted development because the submitted drawings are not to scale...and not exceed 4 metres in height or have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

**Response:** The drawings are to scale as demonstrated above and do not exceed 4 metres in height (eaves less than 3m) and have a width less than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

Yours Sincerely,

Shaida Razaq and Amjad Ali

