

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1745/P	Joanne O'Brien	2 Wesleyan Place London NW51LG	17/05/2025 17:28:39	COMMNT	<p>In general the following claim by the applicant has not been followed through: 'The introduction of and possible reinstatement of traditional details to the shop front will preserve and enhance the local street and bring restoration to the local neighbourhood.'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new front elevation is defective in a number of ways. It is wrong to claim that the original mid-19th century pre-demolition detail on the front brick elevation is 'out of place'. It should have been retained between the first and second floors in a conservation area where existing features should be preserved.</li> <li>2. The brick detail at the top of the front elevation should be restored so that the new elevation is in keeping with the other front elevations on the terrace. Remedial work should take place on the existing structure to restore the detail.</li> <li>3. Please note, the drawing of the existing building before re-build is not correct as it does not include the existing brick detail at the top of the facade of no 151 Highgate Rd. and should not have been omitted.</li> <li>4. The existing building elevation drawing is also totally inaccurate.</li> <li>5. The front window at street level looks very different to the drawing on the original application. There is no ventilation in the front window. Surely that should be required?</li> <li>6. There are two questions on the application which have been answered incorrectly from a factual point of view. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is this application for a mixed use proposal that includes residential uses? The answer given is no. It should be yes.</li> <li>b) Superseded consents Does this proposal supersede any existing consent(s)? Answer given: no. It should be yes</li> </ol> </li> </ol>