

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/0504/P | Mr Jurgen Huck | 26a Elsworthy Road | 24/02/2014 15:34:53 | OBJ | As I stated in my previous comments related to this subject (Appeal ref num: APP/X5210/C/13/2206787), the applicant has made a mockery of the planning process by intentionally not following the approved plans. The resulting building works (standing today) bare little resemblance to the approved plans of a 'studio' and 'rear extension'. What exists is a single giant, entirely enclosed, extension that stretches the length of the property. We now have a ten foot fence between our properties to shield the massive structure. This has curtailed our light and compromised our view. I am certain that the building works, if the initial planning proposal would have accurately reflected them, would never have been approved. There is no precedent for the completed building works in the neighbourhood and it was my understanding that Camden had asked they be dismantled - which has not occurred. The building works were not approved as constructed and should be removed immediately. I would view any other solution as a parody of justice as the breaches of the planning approval are so apparent. I am following this case closely and have taken legal advice as such. Finally, and suspiciously, I have never received in the mail any planning documents from the council related to Mr. Grant's planning applications. Regards, Mr. Huck |
| | | NW3 3DL | | | |
