

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1896/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	06/05/2019 10:41:48	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>17 April 2019 17 Edis Street NW1 8LE      2019/1896/P</p> <p>In this case, we objected to the previous application, 2016/7041/P, and sought the set back of the proposed infill. When that application was granted, 21 April 2017, there was no report published for the Members' Briefing, required when a CAAC objects.</p> <p>Our basic objection to the building line of the infill stands, although we have no objection to the modification of the fenestration.</p> <p>We are always concerned when planning consents are not adhered to in the work actually carried out, and a variation to the original consent not obtained before the work is done. Is it possible for LPAs to charge a supplementary fee for retrospective applications?</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>
2019/1896/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	06/05/2019 10:41:53	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>17 April 2019 17 Edis Street NW1 8LE      2019/1896/P</p> <p>In this case, we objected to the previous application, 2016/7041/P, and sought the set back of the proposed infill. When that application was granted, 21 April 2017, there was no report published for the Members' Briefing, required when a CAAC objects.</p> <p>Our basic objection to the building line of the infill stands, although we have no objection to the modification of the fenestration.</p> <p>We are always concerned when planning consents are not adhered to in the work actually carried out, and a variation to the original consent not obtained before the work is done. Is it possible for LPAs to charge a supplementary fee for retrospective applications?</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>