

9 March 2015

Duran Z Ross
Flat 4
9 Hilltop Road
London
NW6 2QA

Ms Jenna Litherland
Camden Regeneration and Planning Dept.
Town Hall
Judd Street
WC1H 8ND

By E-mail and Post

Dear Ms Litherland

**Applications Nos 2013/7792/P and 2013/7801/P
Nos 5 and 7 Hilltop Road**

I write to object to the two abovementioned planning applications.

No. 5:

The owner has converted No. 5 into 2 flats, a ground and 1st floor flat and 2nd floor flat. That means that the application for a Certificate ought to be rejected by Camden since the Permitted Development for a rear extension does not apply in law to any building consisting of one or more flats.

In addition, the plans show that the extension is supposed to be added onto an existing fairly shallow extension, but I think that the plans may exaggerate how deep that existing extension really is: the only people who can - and should - check are Camden's Planning Department. (The existing shallow extension is shown as being 2.00 m, so far as we can judge.) If the position of the rear wall has been exaggerated, the effect is to create a new extension which would be deeper than the permitted depth of 4 metres from the existing (actual) rear wall.

No 7:

This is a single unit house. So, the regulations for a Permitted Development could apply. However, I think that the owner may be exaggerating the depth of the existing shallow rear extension (the application plans show 2.75 metres). If so, then what he is really doing will be to create:

- a. a new rear extension onto the existing shallow one;
- b. 2 rear and side extensions on either side of the rear extension; and
- c. the effect is to create a large new rear extension across the full width of the house, when the maximum permitted extension must not exceed ½ the width of the house (Condition A.1(h)).

The proposed plan is also unclear as to what happens to the existing rear extension which has 2 side wall and a rear wall. The plan shows that one side wall and the rear wall are both being removed. That means, we believe, that the whole of existing rear extension is going to be demolished. It follows that anything which is added/built above the new extensions would:

- a. create a rear extension with 2 storeys, and extend beyond 3 metres from the rear wall at every point (offending against Condition A1(f)); and
- b. involve the construction of a veranda, balcony or raised platform (offending against Condition A.1(i)(i)).

In any event, the new extensions will involve the alteration or replacement of a soil and vent pipe, which are not shown on the application plans (offending against Condition A1(i)(iii)).

Yours sincerely

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Duran Ross.

Duran Ross

Mr. Nigel Herdman
Flat 4
159 West End Lane
London NW6 2LG

To: Jenna Litherland
Development Control
Regeneration and Planning Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden
Argyle Street, London WC1H 8ND

Dear Ms Litherland,

**The Further Revisions of the Applications for Permitted Development at Nos 5 and 7 Hilltop Road
by Mr N. Golesorkhi:**

Applications Nos 2013/7792/P and 2013/7801/P

The property developer Mr Golesorkhi, who I remind bought these two houses from the Council as single dweller units has repeatedly attempted to gain permission to build unnecessarily large and ugly extensions to the houses for personal gain. On every occasion we neighbours who truly care about our local environment (unlike Mr Golesorkhi) are required to explain our objections to his applications, and so far we have always succeeded, and for very good reason.

My property overlooks these two properties from the rear, and our view will be severely impaired by the proposals which to date have never been submitted within the parameters of the law.

I very strongly object to the grant of any certificate of permitted development to the owner of these houses because:

1. The plans encroach to a disturbing degree on the precious green environment of our historic garden enclave.

And in particular:-

2. **No. 5 Hilltop Road:**

- i. Mr Golesorkhi is applying for a certificate for a rear extension.
- ii. To our astonishment, as of June 2014 Mr G. has converted No. 5 into 2 flats, ground and 1st floor flat and 2nd floor flat.
- iii. That means that the application for a Certificate ought to be rejected by Camden, since the Permitted Development for rear extensions does not apply in law to any building consisting of one or more flats.
- iv. In addition, the plans show that the extension is supposed to be added onto an existing fairly shallow extension, but we think that the plans may exaggerate how deep that existing extension really is : the only people who can - and should – check are Camden’s Planning Department. (The existing shallow extension is shown as being 2.00 m, so far as we can judge.) If the position of the rear wall has been exaggerated, the effect is to create a new extension which would be deeper than the permitted depth of 4 metres from the existing (actual) rear wall.

3. No 7 Hilltop Road:

- i. Mr G. is applying for two side and rear extensions, one of each side of the existing shallow extension at the rear of No. 7.
- ii. This is still a single unit house. So, the regulations for Permitted Development could apply.
- iii. But once again, we think that Mr G. may be exaggerating the depth of the existing shallow rear extension (the application plans show 2.75 metres). If so, then what he is really doing will be to create:
 - a. A new rear extension onto the existing shallow one;
 - b. 2 rear and side extensions on either side of the rear extension.
 - c. The effect is to create a large new rear extension across the full width of the house, when the maximum permitted extension must not exceed $\frac{1}{2}$ the width of the house (Condition A.1(h)).
- iv. The proposed plan is also unclear as to what happens to the existing rear extension which has 2 side wall and a rear wall. The plan shows that one side wall and the rear wall are both being removed. That means, we believe, that the whole of existing rear extension is going to be demolished. It follows that anything which is added/built above the new extensions would (a) create a rear extension with 2 storeys, and extend beyond 3 metres from the rear wall at every point (offending against Condition A1(f)) and (b) involve the construction of a veranda, balcony or raised platform (offending against Condition A.1(i)(i)).
- v. In any event, the new extensions will involve the alteration or replacement of a soil and vent pipe, which are not shown on the application plans (offending against Condition A1(i)(iii)).

4. At each house the extensions will involve the removal or alteration of one or more chimneys, flues and/or soil and vent pipes. (These are not shown on his drawings at all as they ought to have been, but they exist and are in the way of what he proposes to build.) **This requires full planning permission - which he has not applied for.**

5. The appearance of any extension must match that of the existing building, and judging from his previous attempt to build extensions there will be no attempt whatever to do this.

6. Please be aware that Mr Golesorkhi has effectively declared war on the local residents. He has made it plain with a continuous bombardment of applications, none of which have conformed with the legal parameters, that he is intent on building as large extensions as he can get away with. There is more at stake here than mere legal formalities, there is a critically important environmental issue which will affect many lives in our little area of calm amidst the busy area around us.

Yours sincerely [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Nigel Herdman [REDACTED]

Flat 4, 159 West End Lane, London NW6 2LG
[REDACTED]

+