

Mr M Genet

Development Control  
Planning Services  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Argyle Street  
London WC1H 8ND

27/10/2011

Our ref:  
14457P/COR/2.01/SUB/03

Cc:  
Chris Foster (The Interiors  
Group)

Enc:  
Additional Information

Dear Mr Genet

**Subject: Invalid Application 2011/3803/INVALID for Planning and Listed Building Consent for the Insertion of Air Conditioning Units to 6 Bedford Square, London (Originally Submitted Under Planning Portal Application PP-01553373)**

Following receipt of your Invalid Letter (3) by e-mail on 22<sup>nd</sup> September, we have now re-submitted a revised drawing via the Planning Portal.

As requested, this revised drawing provides details of the proposed air conditioning units in elevation, as well as section. The application should now be validated immediately.

Please note that, as previously discussed, the CLG Document '*Guidance on Information Requirements and Validation*' makes it clear that:

*"LPAs should make proportionate requests for information, and should not use invalidation to prevent the start of the determination period where an applicant has taken reasonable steps to fulfil the information requirements set out in the local list".*

These requirements were met from the outset. Indeed, you had validated an identical application, with identical information, just a few months earlier.

The guidance goes on to advise that:

*"In some circumstances the supporting information may be inadequate or its quality may be of concern. **These are not grounds for invalidating applications**...Local planning authorities have the ability to request clarification or further information during the determination process" (our emphasis).*

This is the correct procedure and the one that should have been followed from the outset. We have tried to be helpful, in providing the information that you have requested, however it has now reached the stage where we must insist that the application is validated.

If, having visited the site, Officers feel they require any additional information, and this is justified, then we will, of course, be happy to provide it. However, we have met the requirements for validation and this must now be done.

Given the length of time that has elapsed we are now well outside the time period for appealing the application. This is not something that we wish to do, however, we will review this course of action if there are any further unnecessary requests for information.

27/10/2011

Our ref:  
14457P/COR/2.01/SUB/03

**Subject: Proposed Amendments and Alterations to 4-5 Bedford Square,  
London (2010/0126/L)**

We are aware that the details of the application have changed slightly from the original submission. However, we have provided sufficient details of these not only for validation but for determination. If, upon review of the information during the determination of the application, further clarity is required then we would be happy to provide this.

I trust that the information we have provided is sufficient to allow for the application to be validated immediately and determined positively.

I look forward to receiving your response in due course.

Yours sincerely



Gordon Bradford  
Associate  
[g.bradford@scottbrownrigg.com](mailto:g.bradford@scottbrownrigg.com)