

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2015

by George Mapson DipTP DipLD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/X/14/2223188

Land at the rear of 141-149 Spencer Road, Isleworth, London, TW7 4BW

- The appeal is made by Mr Riaz Virani under section 195 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow to refuse to grant a certificate of lawful use or development (LDC).
 - The application Ref 01044/R/O141-149/LAW1, dated 18 November 2013, was refused by a notice dated 14 April 2014.
 - The application was made under section 191(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
 - The use for which an LDC is sought is described on the application form as '*Existing use of property as self contained residential dwelling (C3 use)*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. An LDC appeal is confined to reviewing the Council's decision, to establish whether the refusal to grant an LDC was well-founded.

Background

The appeal site and surroundings

3. The appeal site is a roughly triangular area of land of about 250sqm that was formerly owned by British Telecom. Within the plot stood a small single-storey, detached building that was used as a telephone repeater station. BT still own areas of open land to the north and south of the site, and to the east is an electricity sub-station. The site is located close to a public footpath that links Spencer Road to the south with Great West Road to the north but it has no vehicular access.
4. Since the appellant bought the land in 2006 the building has been considerably altered and extended. According to the Council, it now measures about 12m by 5m. It is now used as a dwellinghouse and the rest of the plot has been fenced off and serves as its garden. Planning permission has been neither sought nor granted for the operational development that has been carried out or for the change of use of the building and land to use as a dwellinghouse and garden.

Planning history

5. Between August 2006 and September 2007 the appellant made three planning applications in respect of the building and land. The first two applications proposed the demolition of the building and the redevelopment of the land for flats. Planning permission was refused in September 2006 and April 2007. The third application was

for a front and side extension to the building and a change of use to use as a self storage facility. Planning permission was refused in November 2007.

6. On 14 October 2013 the Council served an enforcement notice (Ref. OUTR/2012/00562) alleging, without planning permission, the conversion of the premises into a self-contained residential unit¹. The notice required the cessation of that use; the removal of all kitchen and bathroom facilities related to that use; and the removal from the premises of all resultant debris. There was no appeal against the notice and it became effective on 21 November 2013. The compliance period was three months after the notice took effect. That period passed without compliance with the requirements of the notice².
7. On 18 November 2013 the LDC application, the subject of this appeal, was made. The application sought a certificate for the existing use of the property as a self contained residential dwelling (Class C3). On 14 April 2014 the Council decided that the existing use was not lawful.
8. The decision notice lists the documentary evidence that had been provided in support of the application. The reasons for the decision were firstly, that the use was a contravention of the enforcement notice that was served on 14 October 2014; and secondly, that insufficient evidence had been provided to prove that the use of the property as a self contained dwelling had been in existence continuously for more than four years prior to the service of the enforcement notice.

Evidence in LDC cases

General principles relating to LDC cases

9. A certificate of lawful use or development is not a planning permission. Its purpose is to enable owners and others to ascertain whether specific uses, operations or other activities are or would be lawful. Lawfulness is equated with immunity from enforcement action. The issue of a certificate depends entirely on factual evidence about the history and planning status of the building or land in question and the interpretation of any relevant planning law or judicial authority.
10. I note the objections that some local residents have made, at the application and appeal stages, to the use of the appeal building as a dwellinghouse. However, the planning merits are not relevant in deciding an LDC application or appeal and are not therefore an issue for me to consider.
11. The burden of proof regarding decisive matters of fact rests on the applicant, now the appellant. He has asserted that the use of the building as a single dwellinghouse is lawful because it began more than four years before the date of the LDC application, and before the date of issue of the enforcement notice. He must therefore adduce enough relevant, clear and unambiguous evidence to demonstrate the truth of that assertion.
12. The relevant test of the evidence is 'the balance of probability' (i.e., that it is more probable than not).

¹ Although the term '*self contained residential dwelling*' (the existing use for which the LDC was sought) differs from '*self-contained residential unit*' (the alleged breach of planning control cited in the enforcement notice), I am satisfied that the existing use to which both documents refer is the same; one that is properly described as '*use as a dwellinghouse*'. The enforcement notice makes it clear that the alleged breach had taken place within the last four years, the time limit for an unauthorised change of use to a dwellinghouse. The term '*use as a dwellinghouse*' is narrower in its meaning than '*residential*' use, which can include multiple occupation, bedsits, hostels, hotels, guest houses, etc. Furthermore, a '*residential use*' might be taken to mean a use that is incidental or ancillary to a main non-residential use (i.e., not constituting a separate main use in itself). For all changes of use, other than a change to use as a dwellinghouse, the time limit for enforcement action is ten years.

² The enforcement notice is now effective. Section 179(2) of the 1990 Act imposes a criminal liability on the owner of land for failure to comply with an enforcement notice, but the Council has deferred prosecution and /or carrying out the works in default pending the outcome of this appeal.

Evidence in cases involving a material change of use to use as a dwellinghouse

13. With a change of use to a single dwellinghouse³, the time limit for taking action is four years. Establishing the start of that period involves a two-stage process.
14. The first stage is to look at the physical works and ascertain the date that the premises were capable of providing viable facilities for living, rather than the date when all the works were completed. The second stage is to establish when the use actually commenced and whether there was a continuous residential use thereafter, to the extent that the Council could have taken enforcement action against it at any time⁴.
15. On the matter of continuous use, there is a difference between an established dwellinghouse, where an occupier does not have to be continuously or even regularly present in order for it to remain in use as a dwellinghouse, and where there is no established use. In the latter case, the use has to be “*affirmatively established*” at the start of the four year period⁵.
16. It is possible for the change of use to have commenced prior to actual occupation, provided that the premises were capable of being so used. It is a matter of fact and degree as to when the change of use occurs, and it is incorrect for a decision-maker to simply regard the commencement of actual residential use after the conversion as giving rise to the change of use.
17. It is not enough to conclude that because the premises were not in fact actually used, there had not been a change of use. On the other hand, it is more difficult to show a change of use just by physical works and nothing more.

General principles relating to concealed breaches of planning control and time limits

18. In an LDC appeal (or an enforcement appeal on ground (d)) where immunity is claimed because the time limits for enforcement have expired, an appellant may be estopped⁶ from denying the truth of false statements made to the Council at an earlier stage. This type of estoppel is referred to as ‘*estoppel en päis*’ or ‘*estoppel by conduct*’.
19. Although the onus is on the Council to detect unauthorised development within the four or ten year periods, the principle that no one should benefit from their own wrong was applied in the context of the Planning Acts in the Supreme Court judgment in the *Welwyn Hatfield (Beesley)* case⁷, and resulted in section 124 of the Localism Act 2011⁸.

³ There is no definition of a ‘dwellinghouse’ in the 1990 Act, but in *Gravesham BC v SSE and O’Brien* [1983] JPL 306, the distinctive characteristic of a dwellinghouse was held to be ‘its ability to afford those who use it the facilities required for day-to-day private domestic existence’.

⁴ *Impey v SSE & Lake District SPB* [1981] JPL 363, [1984] 47 P&CR 15 and *Backer v SSE* [1983] JPL 167. In *Impey*, the Court held that it was necessary to look at both elements of development involved on the basis that both (i.e. physical state and actual/ intended/attempted use) are important, but neither is decisive.

⁵ The Court of Appeal judgment in *Swale BC v FSS & Lee* [2005] EWCA Civ 1568, [2006] JPL 886 established that the correct approach is to ask whether there was any period during the four years when the building was not physically occupied, even though available for occupation, when the local planning authority could not have taken enforcement action against the use. It is also necessary to make a finding as to whether the periods of non-occupation were *de minimis* or not. Even though a building might be fitted out for residential use the question was whether it had been actually used as a dwelling for a continuous period, apart from *de minimis* breaks.

⁶ Estoppel - a legal doctrine derived from a Norman French word meaning to stop, bar, or preclude.

⁷ *SSCLG and another (Beesley) v Welwyn Hatfield BC* [2011] UKSC 15, 6 April 2011. See also the preceding judgments of: (1) the High Court in *R. (on the application of Welwyn Hatfield Council) v SSCLG and Beesley* [2009] EWHC 966 (Admin), 7 April 2009 [2010] JPL 352; and (2) the Court of Appeal in *Welwyn Hatfield Council v SSCLG v Beesley* [2010] EWCA Civ 26, 29 January 2010 [2010] JPL 1095.

⁸ Sub-section 124(1) of the Localism Act adds sections 171BA, 171BB and 171BC to s171B to the 1990 Act. They allow (in England) for enforcement action when the usual time limits have expired and when the breach has been deliberately concealed. The amended section 194 of the 1990 Act provides that it is an offence to provide false or misleading information or to withhold material information with intent to deceive. Section 193(7) enables a local

20. The statutory immunity periods were conceived as periods during which the Council would normally be expected to discover an unlawful building operation or use, after which the general interest in proper planning control should yield and the status quo prevail.
21. However, positive and deliberately misleading false statements made by an owner, which successfully prevent discovery, take the case outside that rationale. This means that those immunity periods cannot be relied upon where there was a positive deception in matters integral to the planning process, which was directly designed to avoid enforcement action within the relevant period and succeeded in doing so.
22. I deal with these matters, in the context of this appeal, in paragraphs 47 to 52 below.

Reasons

The gist of the appellant's case

23. At the application stage, the appellant's first agent, Ideal Planning and Design Limited, submitted supporting documentary evidence and a covering letter (dated 18 November 2013). The appellant's case was that the use of the appeal building as a telephone repeater station "*ended several years ago, and the applicant subsequently bought the property and let it out as a residential bungalow in March 2007. The property has been in residential use ever since 1st March 2007.*"
24. The documentary evidence dealt mainly with the occupation of the building after it was converted. It consisted of four tenancy agreements (from June 2008 to June 2012), three Council Tax Demand Notices (8 Oct 2012, 8 Mar 2013 and 13 Aug 2013), bank statements (May, June and July 2013) and correspondence between the tenant and the Council (9 Aug 2013 to 15 Nov 2013).
25. At the appeal stage, the appellant's second agent, WS Planning and Architecture, submitted additional documentary evidence that dealt mainly with the operational works that were carried out to the building. In his submission, these documents indicate that the conversion work commenced in July 2007 and that the building was completed and habitable by 11 October 2007.
26. The use had inured for well in excess of four years before the enforcement notice was issued in October 2013. It is therefore lawful and a certificate should be issued.

The Council's case

27. The Council's case is that the appellant is required to show four years continuous occupation before 14 October 2013, the date that the enforcement notice was issued. The relevant date for the LDC application and appeal is therefore 14 October 2009.
28. The only documents that cover the period before 2012 are tenancy agreements. These may show an *entitlement* to occupy the premises but they do not show that the premises were occupied continuously throughout the length of those tenancies.
29. The property was not assessed by the District Valuer for Council Tax purposes until September 2012. The Council Tax Valuation Officer confirmed, on 8 April 2014, that the case of this property had been referred to the District Valuer as a result of a benefit application and visit to the property that were made in June 2012.
30. Although the requirement for Council Tax payments was backdated to March 2007, no information was provided to show why that date was chosen. The March 2007 date, though mentioned in the LDC application's covering letter, appears to conflict with other information supplied by the appellant. Photographs taken when the site was

planning authority to revoke, at any time, a certificate that they may have issued as a result of false or misleading information.

visited on 24 August 2007 show that the property was still under construction at that time.

31. On 8 August 2008, in response to an enquiry by the Council regarding the intended use of the building, the appellant wrote to confirm that he was "*not converting the property to a residential house*" and that he planned to use it for the storage of paper files which he believed he was entitled to do. The wording of this letter suggests that work on converting the building was still ongoing at that time.

My assessment of the evidence and conclusions

Schedule (see pages 8 to 10)

32. I have appended a Schedule to my decision that sets out the sequence of relevant events following the appellant's acquisition of the site in 2006, as revealed by the evidence provided by the parties. This has assisted my assessment and conclusions on the two-stage process for establishing the start of the four year period for taking enforcement action.

Stage 1 - The conversion of the building to enable its use as a dwellinghouse

33. At the application stage, the appellant's first agent provided no evidence pertaining to the conversion of the building into a dwellinghouse. Instead, he made an unsubstantiated assertion that the property had been in residential use since March 2007.
34. At the appeal stage, in section F of the appeal form, the appellant's second agent made the same unsubstantiated assertion. He claimed that "*The property was refurbished for residential use and has been rented out since March 2007 and continues to be in this use to this day.*"
35. Neither assertion is supported by the documentary evidence that was submitted in support of the appeal. The invoice of Mat Bud (13 July 2007) seeks payment from the appellant for "*labour for foundation of building works*". Although the invoice does not refer to where or when these works were carried out, the inference to be drawn is that the foundations were those for the extension to the telephone repeater station building.
36. The extension must have been substantially completed by September 2007 because the invoices, the contractual agreement and associated correspondence, dated 10, 11 and 12 September 2007, indicate that the internal and external works to convert the building into a dwellinghouse were about to take place at that time. Thames Water Authority's invoice of 12 September confirms that water connections to the property were also made around the same time.
37. The Council's evidence includes a black and white photocopy of two photographs, which are dated 24 August 2007. Although they are of poor quality, they appear to show that building work was underway, but incomplete, at the appeal site.
38. Whilst those photographs appear to support the appellant's claims, the Council has produced a letter, dated 8 August 2008, from the appellant to the Council (stamped '*Environment Department 12 August 2008*') which contradicts his documentary evidence. In this letter the appellant robustly denies that the property was being converted to residential use at that time and claimed that it currently had no water supply. It is evident from the array of conflicting evidence now submitted on his behalf that these assurances were false and must have been given with the intention of deliberately misleading the Council. I return to this matter at paragraphs 47 to 52 below.
39. The documentary and photographic evidence before me leads me to conclude, on the balance of probability, that works on extending the building and converting it to enable its use as a dwellinghouse began in the summer of 2007, but there is no documentary or

photographic evidence to show when works were substantially completed and the building became habitable.

Step 2 – continuous use of the building as a dwellinghouse

40. I turn next to the evidence relating to the start of the use of the building as a dwellinghouse.
41. The first three tenancy agreements for the property were handled by the appellant's own company, Delightful Properties Limited, rather than by letting agents. The first of these agreements was signed and dated by the tenant, G Ramstead, but was neither signed nor dated by the landlord or a representative on his behalf. On its face, the tenancy period began on 3 June 2008 and ran for two years. It might be reasonable to assume that occupancy would follow more or less straightaway, but the appellant's letter to the Council of 8 August 2008 (see paragraph 38 above) told a different story.
42. There is no evidence, whether documentary, photographic or testimony, to show that G Ramstead lived in the property at all, let alone continuously for the duration of his two year tenancy. There are no company bank statements from Delightful Properties Ltd to show receipt of the monthly rent payments; there are no utility bills, no documents at all with G Ramstead's name and the appeal property's address on.
43. The second tenancy agreement for the property was also handled by the appellant's company. On its face, the tenancy period began on 12 June 2010 and ran for twelve months. Although it was signed by the prospective tenant, Blazej Czyzvk, it was not dated, and was neither signed nor dated by the landlord or a representative on his behalf. As with G. Ramstead, there is no evidence to show that Blazej Czyzvk lived in the property and, if he did, there is nothing to show that he lived there continuously for the duration of his twelve month tenancy.
44. The third tenancy agreement for the property was also handled by the appellant's company. On its face, the tenancy period began on 13 June 2012 and ran for twelve months. It was signed by the prospective tenant, Michele Drake and dated 13 June 2011, but was neither signed nor dated by the landlord or a representative on his behalf. As with G. Ramstead and Blazej Czyzvk, there is no evidence to show that Michele Drake ever lived in the property and, if she did, there is nothing to show that she lived there continuously for the duration of her 12 month tenancy.
45. Those first three tenancies cover the period from 2 June 2008 until 12 June 2012. Only when the fourth tenant signed an Assured Shorthold Tenancy Agreement is there any obvious evidence of residential occupation of the property. That agreement was handled by A&S Lettings, of Hounslow and was for a term of twelve months beginning on 18 June 2012. The tenant was Mrs Zsysanna Karpatine Buza⁹, and documents appear to show that she lived at the appeal property for at least thirteen months between October 2012 and November 2013. They provide the only tangible evidence of residential occupation of the appeal premises during the four year period preceding the issue of the enforcement notice.
46. On the balance of probability, I find that insufficient relevant, clear and unambiguous evidence has been produced by the appellant to demonstrate the truth of his assertions firstly, that the use of the building as a dwellinghouse was affirmatively established at the start of the four year period preceding the issue of the enforcement notice; and secondly, that there was a continuous residential use throughout that period to the extent that the Council could have taken enforcement action against it at any time.

⁹ This is her name as it appears on her own correspondence (on letters that appear to have been written on her behalf), but on other documents it appears as 'Zsuzsanna Karpatine Buza' and 'Mrs Zsysanna Buza Karpatine'.

Other matters

The concealed breach of planning control

47. The evidence indicates to me that the appellant deliberately deceived the Council in order to gain immunity for the use of the building as a dwellinghouse.
48. He knew that from July 2007 to September 2007 works were underway that were clearly intended to convert the telephone repeater station building to enable its use as a dwellinghouse. The works were being carried out to his specification. Yet on 18 September 2007 he submitted a planning application [Ref. 01044/B/P3] seeking permission to erect front and rear extensions and change its use to a self storage facility. It seems to me more probable than not that this application was made in order to throw the Council off the scent and conceal his true intentions for the appeal building, which he was pursuing at precisely the same time.
49. On 8 August 2008, a year after the works to convert the building commenced, he wrote to the Council offering his assurance that *"We are not converting the property to residential use"* and *"Any works that we may be carrying on at present are purely cosmetic and in order that we may use the building and land for our personal use."* Yet his evidence shows that on 2 June 2008 he had already let out the property to G. Ramstead on a two year residential tenancy agreement.
50. In the same letter, he told the Council that *"We have applied for water to be connected to the building, as there is currently no water supply. Works that we recently carried out at the site were essential water works required for water connection to take place."* Yet his evidence shows that Thames Water had invoiced him for these works on 12 September 2007 with a requirement for payment by 29 September 2007.
51. Also in the same letter, he claimed *"We then plan on using the building for our storage of paper files which we believe we are more than entitled to do"*. However, he would have been well aware at that time that there was no such entitlement. The lawful use of the appeal building was as a telephone repeater station (a sui generis use) and, as such, a proposed storage use would entail a material change of use requiring planning permission. The appellant would be aware of that, having made a planning application for just such a change of use on 18 September 2007. He would also have been aware that permission had been refused by the Council on 6 November 2007.
52. From the evidence it is apparent to me that the appellant knew, or at least believed, that what he was saying to the Council in that letter was not true. Even if he had been able to demonstrate, on the balance of probability, that the appeal building had been used as a single dwellinghouse continuously throughout the relevant four year period, his positive and deliberately misleading false statements to prevent discovery would take the case outside the rationale of the statutory provisions of the Planning Acts. Put simply, in view of his deceitful behaviour, the time limits for enforcement action in a case such as this would not apply.

Conclusions

53. I have taken account of all the matters raised in the written representations. For the reasons given above I conclude that the Council's refusal to grant a Certificate was well-founded and that the appeal should fail.
54. I will exercise accordingly the powers transferred to me under section 195(3) of the 1990 Act as amended.

George Mapson

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE

Timeline of relevant events following the appellant's acquisition of the appeal site in 2006, derived from the parties' documentary and photographic evidence

Date	Appellant's evidence	Council's evidence
3 Aug 2006		Planning application made by Delightful Properties Ltd for demolition of existing telephone repeater station and erection of a three-storey residential building comprising 9 one-bedroom self contained flats [Ref. 01044/B/P1].
9 Sep 2006		Planning permission refused [Ref. 01044/B/P1].
1 Mar 2007	Date supplied to the District Valuer as the start of the use of the former telephone repeater station as a dwellinghouse. The Council Tax Demand Notice, dated 8 October 2012, required payments backdated to 1 March 2007.	
15 Mar 2007		Planning application made by Delightful Properties Ltd for demolition of existing telephone repeater station and erection of a two-storey residential building comprising 4 one-bedroom self contained flats [Ref. 01044/B/P2].
26 Apr 2007		Planning permission refused [Ref. 01044/B/P2].
13 Jul 2007	Invoice from Mat Bud to Delightful Properties Limited for ' <i>Labour for foundation of building works Part payment</i> [cost quoted]'. The invoice contains no details of where and when these works were carried out; there is explicit link to the appeal property.	
24 Aug 2007		Photocopied page entitled " <i>Old telephone exchange, Spencer Road 24/8/07</i> " containing two photographs of the appeal building.
10 Sep 2007	Agreement signed by the appellant and his contractor (Lantech International Ltd) to undertake and complete internal and external works, and internal installations, for Delightful Properties Limited. Site address given as Great West Road, Osterley, Middlesex TW7.	
11 Sep 2007	Invoice (No. 2007/009) from Lantech International Ltd to Delightful Properties Limited for ' <i>work done as per the drawing and specifications (sic) made by Riaz Virani Total charge for materials and labure (sic) [cost quoted]</i> ' There are hand written notes on the page which say: " <i>Contract price [cost quoted] Paid 13/9/09 [amount received]</i> ".	
12 Sep 2007	Letter from LRP Richmond Properties, signed by Riaz Virani, to Lantech International Ltd confirming that Invoice No. 2007/009 relates to the agreement and specification of works signed by Lantech on 10 September 2007. It states that the full address of the job is	

	"Former BT Telephone Repeater Station, Great West Road, Osterley, Middlesex."	
12 Sep 2007	Invoice from Thames Water Utilities for "Laying 95m of 100mm Fuchs Steel Main; Connection to main supply ...etc; Network charge waste water for new build public or business (entered twice)" An itemised bill gives a total cost and a Due Date for payment of 26/09/07.	
18 Sep 2007		Planning application made by Delightful Properties Ltd for change of use from telephone repeater station to a self storage facility incorporating a front and side extension [Ref. 01044/B/P3].
6 Nov 2007		Planning permission refused [Ref. 01044/B/P2].
2 Jun 2008	Copy of 1 st Tenancy Agreement managed by Delightful Properties Ltd (landlord) for "Bungalow on path at Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4UB". Signed and dated by the tenant, G. Ramstead, but not signed or dated by the landlord. Term of tenancy 24 months; 3 June 2008 - 2 June 2010.	
8 Aug 2008		Letter headed LRP Richmond Properties, signed by Riaz Virani to Gerald McCormack, Council of the London Borough of Hounslow, entitled "Re: Building at Spencer Road, Isleworth". This letter is stamped "Environment Department 12 August 2008". Mr Virani refers to the Council's letter to him of 6 August 2008 and writes "We are not converting the property to residential use. We have applied for water to be connected to the building, as there is currently no water supply. Works that we recently carried out at the site were essential water works required for water connection to take place. We then plan on using the building for our storage of paper files which we believe we are more than entitled to do. Any works that we may be carrying on at present are purely cosmetic and in order that we may use the building and land for our personal use."
12 Jun 2010 (Assumed)	Copy of 2 nd Tenancy Agreement managed by Delightful Properties Ltd (landlord) for "Bungalow on path at Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4UB". Signed by the tenant, Blazej Czyzvk, but not dated, and not signed or dated by the landlord. Term of tenancy 12 months; 12 June 2010 - 11 June 2011.	
13 Jun 2011	Copy of 3 rd Tenancy Agreement managed by Delightful Properties Ltd (landlord) for "Bungalow on path at Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4UB". Signed and dated by the tenant, Michele Drake, but not signed or dated by the landlord. Term of tenancy 12 months; 13 June 2011 - 12 June 2012.	
18 Jun 2012	Copy of 1 st "Assured Shorthold Tenancy Agreement" managed by A&S Lettings for the letting of a residential dwelling flat for "Land on Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4BW" signed by the tenant, Zsuzsanna Karpatatine Buza, but undated, and 'signed' "A&S Lettings" (no signature) and undated.	

	Witnessed by Ms R Sangha (?), who signed, but did not date her signature. Term of tenancy 12 months; 18 June 2012 - 18 June 2013.	
6 Oct 2012	1 st Council Tax Demand Notice 2012/13 to A&S Lettings Re: Bungalow R/O 141-149 Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4BW	
9 Mar 2013	2 nd Council Tax Demand Notice 2012/13 to Mrs Zsysanna Buza Re: Bungalow R/O 141-149 Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4BW	
24 May 2013; 27 Jun 2013; 26 Jul 2013;	Barclays Bank Statements for "Mrs Z B Karpatine" showing address as Bungalow R/O 141-149 Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4BW	
13 Aug 2013	3 rd Council Tax Demand Notice 2012/13 to Mrs Zsysanna Buza Re: Bungalow R/O 141-149 Spencer Road, Isleworth, TW7 4BW	
9 Aug 2013; 30 Sep 2013	Letters from London Borough of Hounslow Revenue Services to Zsysanna Karpatine Buza re: Housing Benefit and Council Tax matters.	
23 Sep 2013; 15 Nov 2013	Letters from Zsysanna Karpatine Buza to London Borough of Hounslow Revenue Services re: Housing Benefit and Council Tax matters.	