

Application No: 2020/1680/P
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]
Received: 22/06/2020 17:38:56
Comment: OBJ

Response:

Dear Sirs,
I write to you in respect of the above application in my capacity as the director of Hamlet Group Limited, the Freeholder of the above property. Mr Shah had not sought Freeholder, or statutory approval prior to carrying out works to this beautiful building. He is only now applying retrospectively for Freeholder, planning and building regulations permissions/approval as a result of necessary action due to substandard and substantial works becoming apparent. As a focused point, this application is misleading because it is being made for the alterations of what is there now and not for what was there back in 2017/2018 prior to the works having been carried out. The kitchen extension as it appears on the submitted existing plans was not there prior to 2017. I would further point out that the overall appearance of what is being proposed is not in keeping with either the property in question or with the surrounding properties. Consequently, the kitchen extension proposal detracts from the appearance of the front elevation and the joinery as installed and proposed does not match the original elements.

In terms of other issues with what has been submitted I would point out as follows:

1. The plans do not show the extent of the garden area he has in his control. The rear fence is missing.
2. The site location plan indicates the whole of the courtyard area as belonging to Mr Shah - that is not the case and is confirmed by Land Registry searches.
3. The existing plans show the kitchen extension as already in place which is misleading. The kitchen and the adjunct structure/boiler house in the front courtyard were added by Mr Shah in 2017-18 and were not approved and this is what he should be considered for approval now. Plans should have submitted for site layout prior to all construction having been carried out and the proposal for all that has been built since.
4. The existing drawings show the wrong windows in place.

Whilst in principal I have no objection to a well-designed extension that is in keeping with the character of the property and is not to the detriment of the Freeholder and other Leaseholder and one that is built completely within Mr Shahs demise, I do feel that Mr Shah has taken liberties in what he has built and is now trying to frustrate and obfuscate what is meant to be a collaborative process to rectify the situation by presenting what he has built as existing.

I am happy to discuss this matter further with the planning officer and provide further information should it be so required. I request that due consideration is given to the points which I have made above.

[REDACTED]