From: Paul Thomas

**Sent:** 24 December 2023 11:21

To: Planning

Cc: Ramesh Depala; Parnjit Singh

Subject: Objection to Application 2023/4104/P (addendum to my email of 10 December

2023)

Attachments: Objection to Application 2023/4104/P and report of continued breach of

Application 2019/3275/P

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Sirs

Following my email of 10 December 2023 (attached), I am writing to take issue with a point raised by Russell Clark of Clark Designs Limited in his email to "Planning" of 21 December 2023.

In that email, Mr Clarke says "The builder used the same materials on the dormers on No 7 to make it match with No 4 and No 5.". This comment begs the question "Who is in charge here?". Is it the builder, who should be given carte blanche to choose unconsented materials that they think are more appropriate? Or, if the builder has a 'better idea' than the consented plans, should they first seek a revised consent from Camden Council, rather than a retrospective one, only after unconsented materials have already been employed?

What is particularly odd here is that the same builder had already made precisely the same mistake a few months earlier on No 2, which then had to be rectified following Camden Council's ruling of 2 June 2023. So, it is not as if the builder (and/or Mr Clark) is unaware that the original consented material (code 5 lead) should be used, notwithstanding retrospective (failed) efforts by No 2 to retain their unconsented slate.

It would seem logical that the consent and build process should follow the following path:

- (a) Property owner seeks consent
- (b) Camden Council gives consent
- (c) Builder builds in accordance with the consent

Nos 2 and 7 both achieved (a) and (b), but then both identically failed to do (c) as regards their dormer cheek materials. In the case of No 2, Camden Council ruled in June 2023 that No 2 should replace unconsented slate for consented lead and No 2 has subsequently complied. Surely the same should apply to No 7, otherwise:

- $\infty$   $\;$  Consented building materials can be ignored at the whim of the builder.
- $\infty$  It would be an astonishing volte-face by Camden Council.

**Requests:** I reiterate my requests of 10 December 2023 that Application 2023/4104/P is refused and that Application 2019/3275/P is enforced in respect of the consented lead cheeks and timber frame sash dormer windows.

Best regards

Paul Thomas

PS: I have sent an email because the online comments form in the Camden Council website is currently unavailable.

#### **Paul Thomas**

Managing Director

#### Pi Capital

16 St. James's Street London SW1A 1FR

#### W picapital.co.uk



### **About Pi Capital**

Pi Capital is a unique investor network that finds exciting growth equity and alternative asset investment opportunities for its members, and negotiates participation in select private equity deals and funds. It allows individual investors to participate in transactions on an opt-in basis that are usually the exclusive preserve of institutions. In addition to investment opportunities, Pi Capital offers its members a vibrant social and educational programmes, holding expert speaker lunches, charity dinners, and arts and philanthropy events.

# AUTHORISED AND REGULATED BY THE FINANCIAL CONDUCT AUTHORITY (NUMBER: 185688)

This email and any attachment to it are strictly confidential and contain proprietary information some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is intended for use by the original named person only. If an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this email, please delete this message and any attachment from your system and notify the author by replying to this email or telephoning the number above. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print, or rely on this email or attachment or any part of them in any form whatsoever. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Pi Capital or any of its group companies. Internet communications are not guaranteed to be secured or without viruses. Neither Pi Capital nor any of its group companies accepts any responsibility for any loss or damage arising from any unauthorised use of, access to or interference with this email or any of its attachments or for the transmission of any virus. Any unauthorised use or disclosure may be unlawful. The avallability of products, services and opportunities may be limited by applicable laws and regulations in certain jurisdictions. Any action that you may take in relation to this email shall be at your own risk. Unless specifically indicated, this message is not an offer to sell or a solicitation of any investment products or other financial product or service, an official confirmation of any transaction, or an official statement of Pi Capital or any of its group companies. This email and any replies to it may be monitored. Pi Capital is the trading name of Private Investor Capital Limited which is registered in England and Wales with company number 03385330.

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more <u>Click Here</u>.