

20.12.18

GUY SOULSBY & CHRISTINE BEARDSSELL

31 EDIS STREET

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND TO SUPPORT OUR APPEAL

***The following paragraphs gives you the key points and background on this matter.**

31 Edis Street (Guy Soulsby & Christine Beardsell)

A hand delivered letter was posted through our letterbox on Friday 31st August. Our initial thought was that this was a scam or a hoax, but we contacted John Sheehy whose name was on the letter to make sure it was genuine as we could not believe the content. To our amazement it was a real letter. Since then we have had back and forth emails with John Sheehy with regard to the lights that are on the inside walls at the entrance to our house at Number 31 Edis Street.

Sadly John has given conflicting information, and in some cases no information at all, added to that no explanation has been forthcoming as to why we are being targeted when there are multiple houses with entrance lights on our street (Edis Street) and dozens of other houses with entrance lights on the surrounding streets.

John Sheehy told us the previous owner (developer Chris Savva) was contacted over 3.5 years ago in regards to the entrance lights, although John Sheehy is unable to provided us with any records/letters to show that contact was made with the previous owner.

When asked why it has taken him 3.5 years to contact us, he had no answer.

When we bought the property we had all possible checks and searches undertaken by our solicitor so there would be no nasty surprises. We got the all clear. I raised this with John Sheehy who informed me that enforcement cases are filed under a different category, hence why it was missed, quote "Enforcement investigations only appear on local land charges when formal action is taken so the majority of enforcement investigations do not appear on land searches." If such a different category exists why could he not provide us with evidence that the previous owner had been contacted about the issue. Added to that why would the council "hide" for want of a better word vital information on properties, so much so that potential buyers could not find required information. This all seems rather odd given the fact that no formal action was taken against the previous owner, a letter was sent (according to

John Sheehy) but no records exist and us (the new owners) only know about all of this 3.5 years after the fact.

There are 8 other houses on Edis Street that have entrance lights, plus the 2 houses currently undergoing renovation works that have had entrance lights installed. Some of the lights on Edis Street have been in place for over 10 years.

We have spoken to our neighbours and none has received the same letters or emails from Mr John Sheehy.

John Sheehy admitted to me in emails (all of which are on the attached PDF) that the Council has "lost control of the entrance lights on Gloucester Avenue" for which there are in excess of 15 houses with entrance lights. If that is the case then it is unfortunate, but it seems wholly unfair to persecute us (and only us) for lights that have been in situ for many years and indeed well before we bought the property.

John Sheehy has been focused on Chalcot Road when the entrance to/ and our actual property are on **Edis Street**.

John Sheehy has ignored all of my research and reasoning in regards to this matter.

It seems to us that we are being singled out by Mr John Sheehy (and Camden Council) for whatever reason and I hope, once you have had an opportunity to peruse this email and attached documents, that you will agree and support our appeal.