

[REDACTED]

From: Peres Da Costa, David
Sent: 16 March 2015 18:40
To: Planning
Cc: Litherland, Jenna
Subject: FW: Changes to application for permitted development at Nos 5 &7 Hilltop Road

Please log as a consultation response.

Jenna - this appears to be for one of your cases from 2013 and still ongoing!

David Peres da Costa
Planning Officer

[REDACTED]

Sent: 14 March 2015 21:35
To: Planning
Subject: Changes to application for permitted development at Nos 5 &7 Hilltop Road

Application Nos 2013/7792/P &2013/7801/P by N Golesorkhi

Dear Sirs,

I
am astounded to have to object to you yet again about the changed above application, the umpteenth in a string submitted by Mr. Goleshorki over the same properties for several years, all refused. One led to a public enquiry at huge expense, which I attended. My neighbours and I are sick and tired of having to voice our strong objections to Mr. Goleshorki's continued applications and would urge you to continue to refuse them as they do not comply with the statutory Permitted D relating to 5 & 7 Hilltop Road.

No 5

I have seen Mr. Goleshorki's proposal and believe he may have increased the depth of the current extension. This should be independently verified. Also, the property is now divided into 2 flats and consequently is not eligible for permitted development, since his application applies to a dwelling house rather than any building comprising one or more flats.

The changed plans do not adequately demonstrate what would happen to what is left of the current small extension and how they would be joined. Also the new drawings fail to show where the chimneys and piping are, which is fundamental in order for the planning authority to issue a certificate.

No 7

Here

Mr, Goleshorki is probably increasing the depth of the existing shallow extension, which should be independently checked. It appears to create a large new extension across the whole breadth of the house. Is the existing extension to be demolished? This is unclear. Is the effect of the application to build a 2-storey new extension reaching more than 3 metres from the rear wall, which contravenes Condition A1(f)? A veranda would also contravene condition A1(i)(i).

Also the drawings do not show the chimneys and pipes. The new extension will also mean altering a current soil and vent pipe, not shown on the plans and contravening Condition A1(i)(iii).

In these circumstances it appears vital that a Certificate of Permitted Development not be given to Mr. Goleshorki, a known property developer, who should be required to make plain his intentions, which seem to be to ruin a lovely residence in a residential neighbourhood where neighbours want it to remain one.

Yours faithfully,

Jonathan Isaacs BA, L.I.M, (Cantab)

163 est End
Lane,
London NW6 2LG