

Jennings, Tina

From: Whittingham, Gideon
Sent: 07 November 2013 10:45
To: Planning
Subject: logged FW: 5, Belsize Lane:retrospective planning /2013/6161/P and 2013/6261/L - obj
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Gideon Whittingham
 Senior Planning Officer (East Area Team)

Telephone: 020 7974 5180

From: Melissa Lipkin-Berman [mailto:melissa.lipkin.b@gmail.com]
Sent: 06 November 2013 23:45
To: Whittingham, Gideon
Subject: Re: 5, Belsize Lane:retrospective planning /2013/6161/P and 2013/6261/L

Please confirm safe receipt of this e mail .thanks

Subject: 5, Belsize Lane:retrospective planning /2013/6161/P and 2013/6261/L

Dear Mr Whittingham,

Please lodge our comments and objections to the application for retrospective planning permission for the "garage" at 5 Belsize Lane NW3

The Appeal inspection stated that there was a height violation of 4 metres and that the building was in breach due to its "overbearing bulk". Obviously, any application to modify what has been refused and is in breach, must clearly show that these aspects are clearly addressed. They have not been.

1) In drawings 3263884, 3263886 and 326971 no relevant dimensions are supplied, making it impossible to assess how far the height will be reduced. This is the crux of the matter and it is clearly unacceptable to omit these crucial details.

2)The provision of various "options" is unacceptable as it confuses the issue. It creates a situation vulnerable to abuse. Clarity is a fundamental requirement of any application. especially one that has been taken to the highest level.

3) The applicant has a long record of flouting Planning permission and building something bigger, higher or wider . Repeatedly, this has been followed by applications for retrospective permission. This is clearly a misuse of the planning system. Furthermore, since this application has been adjudicated at the highest level and refused as it stands,it is very important that any work on the building fully meets the requirements set out in in the judgement.

This application is unclear and lacks the detailed measurements required to seriously consider it.

On these grounds we object to this application.

Dr Anthony Berman
Melissa Berman
2 Perceval Avenue
NW3 4PY