

# D I S T R I C T

Statement of Case . Householder Application Appeal  
London Borough of Camden Application . 2019/6216/P  
50 Lady Margaret Road . London . NW5 2NP  
March 2020

## **Introduction**

This statement of case has been prepared to accompany our appeal for our proposals at 50 Lady Margaret Road submitted to the London Borough of Camden in December 2019, ref 2019/6216/P

This application follows our prior approved applications in May (Ref 2019/2203/P) and September (2019/2768/P) and seeks approval to only marginally increase the approved rear dormer addition. The new space is to provide a new master bedroom and en-suite with a separate study space.

## **Submission of Application 2019/6216/P**

The application was submitted on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2019 with email notifications of successful payment and submission, via the planning portal, received from the borough later that day. Copies of these emails have been included within our appeal submission as evidence.

As the following weeks fell over the Christmas holidays (our studio was closed from Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> December to 6<sup>th</sup> January 2020) we first followed up progress on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> January. An online check confirmed that the application was not yet visible on the councils own planning database. We therefore contacted the planning admin team by phone and were assured that the application had been registered and validated as of the 12<sup>th</sup> December.

We were given the application reference 2019/6216/NEW. The presence of the word 'NEW' rather than the more familiar 'P' reference in the prior applications led us to question the truth of the registration and validation. However we were assured that the application had been validated and this process along with the uploading of the application to the councils own online publicly accessible database was the responsibility of the allotted case officer. In order to confirm this conversation an email was sent directly to the general planning email inbox cc'ing the allotted case officer Emily Whittredge.

This event raised major concerns with both ourselves and our client over the future progress of the application as we experienced an extremely poor service during the prior application reference 2019/2768/P.

## **Application 2019/2768/P History**

This application was submitted on 28<sup>th</sup> May and similarly did not appear on the Camden online database in the following weeks. We did however manage to contact the case officer, Emily Whittredge by phone and organized a site visit for 4<sup>th</sup> July, some 5 weeks into the 8 week statutory period. This meeting was confirmed in writing on 5<sup>th</sup> July and subsequently comments were requested over the following weeks. Despite our efforts no comments were received and the application past the 8 week statutory period, from the 28<sup>th</sup> May, with no formal response despite the site visit.

On 9<sup>th</sup> August we managed to speak directly to the planning admin team who's suggestion was to confirm our understanding of the process to date by email, cc'ing the senior planner responsible, in this instance Richard Limbrick. This thankfully garnered a response to which the case officer highlighted an IT error for the application not having been formally registered or validated. As such no consultation period had been conducted and any decision on the application would have been unlawful at this stage. As the application had never been registered and validated we had no option other than to agree to extend the statutory period to allow the consultation to take place. This was on the basis that the case officer was to recommend approval of the scheme pending any consultee responses. As none were received a formal approval was finally issued on 9<sup>th</sup> September.

The entire process was incredibly frustrating for both ourselves and our client and as stated to the case officer put us in a position whereby we could not effectively professionally advise our client. The lack of a formal registration and validation some near 4 weeks into the application to which this appeal refers to was therefore a concern that history may repeat itself.

### **Statement of Case**

Following our initial request to confirm receipt, registration and validation with the case officer, no response was received. Further requests for feedback and confirmation of the registration received no reply. Regular checks of the online database confirmed the the application was finally registered and validated on 24<sup>th</sup> January. As no issues were raised with the submitted documentation the application was (we can only assume) validated as of 12<sup>th</sup> December, the date of submission thereby commencing the 8 week statutory period.

As the application was validated so late the three week or rather 21 day consultation period only commenced on 24<sup>th</sup> January running until 14<sup>th</sup> February. This therefore run at odds to the 8 weeks statutory period, the key dates on the online portal confirming a target date of 7<sup>th</sup> February. Despite this and no less than 6 formal requests , along with numerous attempts to reach the case officer by phone, no response has been received to date.

On the 28<sup>th</sup> February and again on 2<sup>nd</sup> March we formally notified the council of our intention to submit an appeal under non-determination of the application. Again despite regular attempts to contact the officer or another officer by phone no response has been received and as such we have advised our client that there only mechanism open to them is to prepare an appeal for non-determination of a Householder Application.

### **Conclusion**

Our appeal application is made on the basis of no response, formal or informal has been received from Camden Council since the submission was made on 12<sup>th</sup> December. Whilst of course frustrating for a domestic client, unfamiliar with the process, and relying on our own advice, the overall process has been equally frustrating to ourselves as an agent.

As noted above copies of the email correspondence have been included within this submission. We wish to further state that the we consider this element of the process entirely unnecessary and a clear waste of time and resources both on our part, the councils and the appeal officer to which this case is to be allotted. We look forward to your response and thank you for your due consideration of this case.