

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> June 2023  
Your ref: APP/X5210/C/23/3320287  
Our ref: EN19/0638  
Contact: Jennifer Watson  
Direct line: 020 7974 4536  
Email: [Jennifer.Watson@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Jennifer.Watson@camden.gov.uk)

**Validation & fast track team  
Regeneration and planning**  
Supporting Communities directorate  
London Borough of Camden  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
5 St Pancras Square  
London  
N1C 4AG  
Tel: 020 7974 8780 Fax: 020  
7974 1680  
[planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)  
[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Site at 10 Antrim Grove, London, NW3 4XR  
Enforcement appeal re 3x air conditioning units  
Appeal by Mrs Antonia Lester**

The Enforcement Notice dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023 instructs that the Appellant: 1) Completely remove the three air conditioning units from side of the residential property and make good any resulting damage; and 2) Remove any resultant debris and paraphernalia from the premises as a result of the above works.

The Council's case for this appeal is largely set out in the officer's delegated report dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023 which was sent with the Questionnaire. The report recommends enforcement action within a period of three months. It sets out how the development is unacceptable on the grounds of noise, design, heritage and climate change. The report also details the site and surroundings, the site history and full consideration of the planning issues.

In addition to the information sent with the questionnaire I would be pleased if the Inspector could take into account the following information and comments before deciding the appeal.

## Summary

The site comprises a three-storey residential property located on the western side of Haverstock Hill. Although not listed, the building is located within the Belsize Park Conservation Area.

On 29/06/2019, a local resident lodged a complaint with the Council regarding the alleged installation of external air conditioning units on the side of the Appeal Property.

The Council opened an enforcement case (ref. EN19/0638) and conducted further investigation.

On 22/09/2020, the Council issued an enforcement notice under Section 171 A (1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, stating that two air conditioning units were installed without planning permission on the side of the residential property adjacent to No. 10 Antrim Grove, NW3 4XR.

The owner appealed the enforcement notice on 02/11/2020 (ref. APP/X5210/C/20/3262422) through their planning agent, Boyer Planning Ltd. The grounds for the appeal included requesting planning permission for the alleged breach and questioning the adequacy of the specified time period in the notice.

During a site visit on 17/06/2021, the Planning Inspector observed three air conditioning units installed on the side elevation instead of the two units mentioned in the enforcement notice. The Inspector offered the Council an opportunity to withdraw the notice, and it was subsequently withdrawn on 06/07/2021.

The owner and the Council engaged in discussions, and on 01/11/2021, a full planning application ref:2021/5353/P was submitted for the installation of three air conditioning units in a lower position on the side elevation, enclosed within an acoustic enclosure. The application was considered to be in conflict with Policies CC1 (Climate change mitigation) and CC2 (Adapting to climate change) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and was therefore refused on 21/12/2022.

Despite the ongoing consideration of the full planning application, the owner submitted a Certificate of Lawfulness (existing) application on 08/06/2022 (ref. 2022/2473/P). The purpose of this application was to demonstrate that the three air conditioning units had been present at the site for a continuous period of four years or more before the enforcement notice was served on 22/09/2020 (ref. EN19/0638).

The Council reviewed the evidence provided by the applicant but deemed it insufficiently precise and unambiguous to support the applicant's assertion.

Additionally, the evidence obtained by the council contradicted and undermined the applicant's version of events. Consequently, the application for a Lawful Development Certificate was refused on 05/10/2022, and the applicant was warned of impending enforcement action if they failed to completely remove the unauthorized units and associated paraphernalia.

A second enforcement notice was served on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023, which is the subject of this statement.

This appeal is made against the Enforcement Notice (ref: EN19/0638), under grounds (a) (b) (c) (d) and (f).

### **Status of Policies and Guidance**

The London Borough of Camden had regard to the relevant legislation, government guidance, statutory development plans and the particular circumstances of the case.

The London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) was formally adopted on 03/07/2017 and has replaced the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Camden Development Policies documents as the basis for planning decisions and future development in the borough.

The overall aims of the policies in the Local Plan, insofar as they relate to this case, are considered to be broadly similar to those in the Council's previous Local Development Framework.

The following policies and guidance are considered to be relevant to the determination of the appeal:

#### **National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

#### **London Plan 2021**

#### **Camden Local Plan 2017**

- A1 - Managing the impact of development
- A4 - Noise and vibration

- D1 - Design
- D2 - Heritage
- CC1 - Climate change mitigation
- CC2 - Adapting to climate change

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

- CPG Design 2021 - chapters 1 (Introduction), 2 (Design excellence) and 3 (Heritage)
- CPG Home Improvements 2021 – sections (Key principles, pages 16-32), (Sustainability, pages 21-27) and (Appendix 1, page 80)
- CPG Amenity 2021 – chapters 1 (Introduction), 2 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook) and 6 (Noise and vibration)
- CPG Energy efficiency and adaption 2021 – chapters 8 (Energy efficiency in buildings) and 10 (Sustainable design and construction principles)
- CPG Planning for health and wellbeing 2021 – sections (Planning for health and wellbeing in Camden, paragraphs 1.4-1.12) and (An integrated approach to health and wellbeing in the Camden Local Plan, paragraphs 1.19-1.29)

### **Belsize Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (adopted November 2002)**

#### **Grounds of Appeal**

The Appellants' grounds of appeal can be summarised briefly as follows and are subsequently addressed in the paragraphs beneath.

An appeal can be made under ground (a) if:

Planning permission ought to be granted or the condition or limitation concerned ought to be discharged;

An appeal can be made under ground (b) if:

The matters stated in the enforcement notice have not occurred;

An appeal can be made under ground (c) if:

The matters stated in the enforcement notice (if they occurred) do not constitute a breach of planning control;

An appeal can be made under ground (d) if:

At the date when the notice was issued, no enforcement action could be taken

An appeal can be made under ground (f) if:

The steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary either to remedy any breach of a planning control or to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach; and/or

## **Appeal Grounds A, B, C, D**

### **Appellant's Case**

The Appellant argues that the original units were installed in 2009 and the 3 x replacement units were installed in 2018. They argue that all the units installed at the property are now permitted and do not constitute a recent breach of planning control. The Appellant claims immunity from enforcement action due to the passage of time, as the original Units were in place for approximately seven years without interruption. They propose that planning permission should be granted, and any necessary mitigation for the Additional Units can be addressed through planning conditions.

It is alleged that both the original units and the replacement units are considered lawful and immune from enforcement action, as no action was taken within 4 years of their installation. The Appellant argues that the initial enforcement notice served on September 22, 2020, was fundamentally defective and should be considered void ab initio.

Finally, it is argued that the units are partially obscured by a high wooden gate and only the very top of the units is visible.

### **Council's Case**

#### **Ground A**

##### *Sustainability*

Paragraph 8.42 of Policy CC2 (Adapting to climate change) specifies that active cooling, such as air conditioning, will only be allowed if dynamic thermal modelling substantiates a genuine necessity for it, after incorporating all preferred measures in accordance with the cooling hierarchy. However, no dynamic thermal modelling has been conducted to justify the proposal and simulate indoor temperatures and conditions to identify potential areas of overheating.

Furthermore, the information provided regarding the "cooling hierarchy" and implemented measures is deemed insufficient to justify the need for the units. For

example, although the report mentions the use of double glazed windows, no specific details have been provided regarding their specifications or characteristics.

Similarly, another example of insufficient detail relates to the rear glazed windows. Although they are referenced, no specific information has been provided regarding their precise location or their effectiveness in addressing issues of overheating.

Concerning the active cooling system itself, the submitted report mentions the proposed Daikin heat pumps as being more energy-efficient compared to conventional condenser units. However, no supporting information has been provided to substantiate this claim or to explain the basis for considering them as more energy-efficient.

Details have not been provided regarding the electricity consumption required to operate the heat pumps in comparison to the potential energy savings achieved through cooling the property. Additionally, information regarding the actual performance and efficiency levels of the specific heat pumps has been omitted. These pieces of information hold particular significance considering that the proposal involves the installation of three units, which appears to be an excessive number for the purpose of providing active cooling in a residential property.

The Council argues that the units are not justified given the availability of opening windows and the property's location on a quiet residential street. Noise produced from traffic on the public highway should not prevent their use. Given the property's large size, allowing for adequate ventilation and London's clement weather, the use of air conditioning units cannot be justified.

### *Noise and Vibration*

The complainant has been regularly updated on the progress of the application process and continues to express concerns regarding the existing unauthorised air conditioning units. Their primary concerns relate to the noise emitted by the units and their continuous operation, which occurs around the clock.

The Appellant's view that the units do not cause undue harm is contrary to complaints from neighbours who claim to be habitually disturbed by the noise produced, contrary to policies A1 and A4 of the Council's Local Plan (2017). These claims are supported by video evidence provided by the complainant (files forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate).

## *Design and Heritage*

Policies D1 and D2 of the Plan are designed to protect the architectural heritage, preserve the visual integrity of buildings and spaces, and ensure that new developments are in harmony with their surroundings.

Special regard has been given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area, which includes the host building itself, under s.16 and s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013. On the contrary, the units are considered to damage the conservation area as they result in a bulky alien feature that obscures the architectural rhyme and scale of the building on which it sits.

The Belsize Conservation Area statement discusses the character of Antrim Grove, specifically noting the Planning and Communication Committee's designation consultation report. The area is described as "having a pleasing distinctive and unspoilt character which together with adjoining gardens and allotments should be preserved or enhanced". The units are at odds with this due to their bulky incongruous features which harm the character and appearance of the property and surrounding conservation area.

Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, as outlined in Section 16 of the NPPF, this harm should be weighed against the public benefit. Harm to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted; the Council can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation.

Whilst the incongruous and hostile addition is considered to have a less than substantial impact on the conservation area, as there is no public benefit from the installation of the air conditioning units, the harm is not justified. In the absence of strong public benefit, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF which seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets. Given the exposed location of the units, screening is not considered to significantly reduce the units' impact on the integrity of the building and appearance of the conservation area.

The Council's approval of several applications for air conditioning units in conservation areas is noted by the Appellant. As the Council did not consider air conditioning units harmful in those instances, the Appellant maintains that the same rationale should apply at the Appeal Property.

The Council argues that none of the applications noted in the Appellant's statement are comparable to those at 10 Antrim Grove. The Council's justification for the approval of the applications cited by the Appellant is outlined below:

Application ref. 2020/2383/P

The proposal relates to a modest unit proposed in the rear garden of the property. Given its location and size, the proposal was generally considered to preserve the open character of the rear garden and host property.

Application ref. 2020/2222/P

The application proposed a unit which would be installed within the front facing terrace at loft floor level, positioned next to and below the height of an existing parapet brick wall and metal grille balustrade. The unit was proposed to be housed within a box enclosure, having an appearance similar to an item of furniture, and clad in dark timber to match as closely as possible the existing timber panels at the front of the host and neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposal would not have any discernible impact upon the appearance of the building nor would it be widely noticeable from public views at the front.

Application ref. 2019/6384

The application relates to units which were proposed to be relocated above an existing side dormer extension and chimney stack. By virtue of their positioning, set well back from the front building line, they would not be visible from views on the public highway.

Application ref. 2019/2713/P

The proposed unit was to be discreetly placed at the rear of the flank wall, in a location not visible from the public highway and out of view from the neighbour's rear windows.

Overall, the above proposals are not considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of their host buildings or conservation areas, in contrast to the units installed at the Appeal Property.

In conclusion, the proposal lacks sufficient justification for active cooling without dynamic thermal modelling and fails to demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative energy-efficient measures in mitigating urban and dwelling overheating, conflicting with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. The appellant's claim that the unauthorised air conditioning units do not cause undue harm is contradicted by ongoing noise and operational concerns expressed by the complainant, supported by video evidence, highlighting violations of local plan policies A1 and A4. Additionally, the Council argues that the air conditioning units negatively impact the character and



appearance of the host property and surrounding conservation area, being bulky and incongruous, obscuring the architectural scale and rhyme of the building, which is in conflict with policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan.

## **Ground B, C, D**

The burden of proof rests with the appellant to substantiate their case, and the standard of proof is based on the balance of probabilities. It is the responsibility of the appellants to present evidence that is precise, clear, and unambiguous. While appellants should be believed if they provide a precise and unambiguous statement, if the Council presents evidence that weakens the likelihood or directly contradicts the appellant's version of events, the appellants will be required to produce corroborating evidence.

In this case, the evidence provided by the Appellant is deemed insufficiently precise and unambiguous by the Council to establish, on the balance of probability, that the three air conditioning units located at the side of the property have been continuously present for a period of four years or more as claimed by the applicant. Furthermore, the Council possesses evidence that contradicts and undermines the Appellant's account.

### Statutory Declarations

None of the declarations (see Appendix 1 attached) provide specific details regarding the number of units. The declarations do not accurately describe the exact location, height, or position of the units.

### Camden New Journal Extract (2016)

A comparison of photographs from the Camden New Journal on March 2016 (see Appendix 2 attached) with a planning officer's photograph from 2022 (see Appendix 3 attached) shows that the equipment was situated in a lower position on the side wall in 2016 compared to the existing equipment currently in place.

### Cover Letter Boyer Planning Ltd

This difference is also evident when considering an Appeal Statement from Boyer Planning Ltd. (agent for application) that includes photographs which show the existing equipment at the time of the enforcement appeal in November 2020 (ref.

APP/X5210/C/20/3262422). One particular photograph (see Appendix 4 attached) shows that the equipment is not in the same location in November 2020.

The letter claims that the three air conditioning units have been present on the site for at least four years prior to 22/09/2020. However, this statement contradicts information provided by the same agent in a planning application for full planning permission ref.2021/5353/P. The Planning Justification Report (see Appendix 5 attached) from Finkernagel Ross (ref. 10ANT-B3-GE211021 rev B) dated 21/10/2021 states, "As part of this reconstruction, which included all services, the heat pump units for the comfort cooling that are the subject of the enforcement, were installed in 2018."

### Google Maps

Photographs from March 2018 and April 2019 (see Appendix 6 attached) taken from similar positions in the street do not show any visible equipment on the side elevation. These photographs contradict the applicant's claim that the three air conditioning units have been continuously present for at least four years prior to 22/09/2020.

An email from the complainant states that the equipment was installed on 28/06/2019, indicating that it was new equipment. A comparison of photographic evidence provided by the complainant on 29/06/2019 (see Appendix 7 attached) with the applicant's photographs from March 2016 supports this view and clearly shows distinct differences in the equipment.

Based on the above information, the Council considers that the evidence provided by the applicant is not sufficiently precise and clear enough to demonstrate, on the balance of probability, that the three air conditioning units have been continuously present at the site for a period of four years or more prior to the date the enforcement notice was served on 22/09/2020 (ref. EN19/0638).

### *Second Bite Provision*

The time limits for issuing an enforcement notice for planning control breaches are outlined in section 171B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Breaches involving building, engineering, mining, or other operations without planning permission have a four-year limit from the date of the breach (section 171B(1)).

In the case of *Jarmain v Secretary of State for the Environment Transport and the Regions* [2000] 2 PLR 126, it was established that a second bite notice does not need to allege an identical breach of planning control as the first notice. It is sufficient for the second bite notice to relate to the same facts. The Court of Appeal rejected the argument that a second notice alleging a different breach could not be valid. As long

as both notices are related to the same facts that give rise to the breach, the second notice falls within section 171B(4)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

As outlined in the sections above, the Council argues that the units were installed in 2018. The first enforcement notice was served in September 2020 but subsequently withdrawn in July 2021. Although the notice that is the subject of this report was served in March 2023, the Council argues that the four year rule must be considered from the date when the notice was withdrawn. The Council therefore argues that the air conditioning units will not be exempt from enforcement action until July 2025.

## **Ground F**

### Appellant's Case

The Appellant argues that the Council's requirement to remove the replacement units goes beyond what is necessary to address the alleged breach. Imposing a planning condition related to cladding and an acoustic enclosure is said to be sufficient to address any concerns.

Moreover, the replacement units are said to be quieter than the original units due to technological advancements in noise reduction. The Appellants have clarified that the units are primarily used during daytime hours when the family is awake, with minimal use during late evenings or overnight.

To support their position, the Appellants commissioned a noise impact assessment on October 15, 2020, which was submitted with planning application ref: 2021/5353/P. The assessment concludes that the noise emissions from the replacement units would not adversely affect the nearest residential property, as long as the outlined noise control strategies are implemented. The report includes acceptable readings taken from the garden and the nearest sensitive receptor, confirming compliance with noise regulations.

### Council's Case

Insufficient details were provided regarding the proposed acoustic enclosure for planning application ref:2021/5353/P, which holds strong significance in terms of both acoustic and design considerations.

The Council's assessment of the enclosure rested upon two key factors: first, it should possess the essential acoustic properties to effectively mitigate noise and achieve the recommended minimum noise level; second, the proposed design, proportions, and positioning of the timber-clad enclosure should be capable of attaining this level

without necessitating a significantly larger or more visually obtrusive structure, which could potentially make the development more prominent.

Should the development be deemed satisfactory from a design perspective by the inspector, the Council would recommend application of a condition requiring acoustic enclosure technical details. This condition would ensure the submission and written approval of enclosure details, as well as ensuring its permanent retention and ongoing maintenance.

## **Conclusion**

The Council has presented evidence contradicting the Appellant's claims that the units were installed within the last four years. It is argued that the four-year rule for enforcement time limits should be considered from the date when the notice was withdrawn, suggesting that the air conditioning units will not be exempt from enforcement action until July 2025.

The Council highlights the lack of sufficient justification for active cooling systems and the absence of dynamic thermal modelling to assess alternative energy-efficient measures. Furthermore, the air conditioning units' bulky incongruous appearance is considered to obscure the architectural scale and rhyme of the building on which it sits, harming the character and appearance of both the host property and surrounding conservation area. In light of the noise disturbances and above-mentioned design concerns, the balancing exercise sides in favour of total removal of the units. On the basis of information available and having regard to the entirety of the Council's submissions, including the content of this letter, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal against the enforcement notice.

If any further clarification of the appeal submissions is required, please do not hesitate to contact Jennifer Watson on the above direct dial number or email address.

Yours sincerely,  
Jennifer Watson  
Planning Officer  
Appeals & Enforcement  
Supporting Communities Directorate

**Appendix 1 – Statutory Declarations from Antonia Lester, Darryl Lazarus, Damien Pitman**

Statutory Declaration of Antonia Lester

I, Antonia Jane Lester, Managing Director of Credit Suisse

of 10 Antrim Grove, London NW3 4XR, make oath and say as follows:

1. I have owned the land and buildings at 10 Antrim Grove, London NW3 4XR for nearly 15 years.
2. When I purchased the house in 2007, we underwent a refurbishment converting the property from 2 flats into one residential house. The refurbishment included installing air conditioning.
3. On 13th March 2016, our house was tragically subject to a severe fire that totally gutted the property and all our possessions as well as the house were totally destroyed. This fire was documented in the Ham & High and featured on Sky News. As you can see from the photos provided dated March 2016 you can see the units were there and in place on the date of the fire.
4. All our paperwork with respect to the development of our house from 2007 onwards to 2016 was burnt in the fire.

Sworn at 10 Antrim Grove, London, NW3 4XR in front of

[REDACTED]

Dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022

Witnessed by

[REDACTED]

6/6/22

ANDREW FRASER  
SOLICITOR  
44 SHIRLOCK ROAD  
LONDON  
NW3 2HS

Statutory Declaration of Darryl Lazarus

I, Darryl Lazarus,

Of Eversley, West End Lane, Essendon, Hatfield, A19 6AT, make oath and say as follows:

1. I am Mr and Mrs Bloom's gardener at 10 Antrim Grove, London NW3 4XR. I am a part time gardener and assist with looking after their front and back gardens for the past 11 years.
2. Part of looking after the gardens requires me to walk down the side passage of their house with the lawn mower.
3. The side passage is quite narrow and has always been a bit tricky to navigate given there has always been air conditioning units attached to the side of the house.
4. I can confirm that these air conditioning units have been in situ on the side of the house from the day I began looking after the garden.

Sworn at 10 Antrim Grove, London, NW3 4XR in front of dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022

Darryl Lazarus

6/6/2022

WITNESSED BY

6/6/22

ANDREW FRASER  
SOLICITOR  
44 SHIRLOCK ROAD  
LONDON  
NW3 2HS

<sup>Dr</sup>  
Statutory Declaration of Damien Pitman

I, <sup>a Dr</sup> Damien Pitman,

of 3 Antrim Grove, London NW3 4XR, make oath and say as follows:

1. I have owned the land and buildings at 3 Antrim Grove, London NW3 4XR for 7 years.
2. I have known Mr and Mrs Bloom of 10 Antrim Grove, since we moved in as we have boys the same age at the same school around the corner.
3. I recall from when I first entered into the house shortly after moving into the street, the property was air conditioned and the air condition units were located on the side house.
4. We witnessed the devastating fire of 10 Antrim Grove and understand all paper work and possessions were destroyed.

Sworn at 3 Antrim Grove, London, NW3 4XR in front of dated 6<sup>th</sup> June, 2022

<sup>Dr</sup>  
Damien Pitman 

Witnessed by  6/6/22

ANDREW FRASER  
SOLICITOR  
44 SHIRLOCK ROAD  
LONDON  
NW3 2HS

**Appendix 2 Camden New Journal - Camden New Journal Photo Following Fire  
(13/03/2016)**





**Appendix 3** – Photographic evidence - equipment in situ 2022 (taken by Planning Officer)



**Appendix 4 - Appeal Statement (extract) from Boyer Planning dated November 2020 (page 33)**



**Appendix 5 - Planning Justification Report (extract) from Finkernagel Ross (ref. 10ANT-B3-GE211021 rev B) dated 21/10/2021 (page 1)**

**PLANNING JUSTIFICATION REPORT**

Job Reference:	10 Antrim Grove, NW3	Date:	21 October 2021
Subject:	Comfort Cooling	Rev.:	<b>B</b>
Issue:	Enforcement Appeal	Our reference:	10ANT-B3-GE211021

**Introduction**

Finkernagel Ross have been appointed to prepare this justification report to support the retrospective planning application in response to the council's enforcement notice ref EN10/0638 in connection with the installation of 3 no external heat pump units at 10 Antrim Grove, London NW3 4XR.

The report intends to place this installation within its physical context by accurately establishing the actual positioning of the units and assess their visibility as well as outlining improvements regarding their visual impact and appearance.

Furthermore, this report seeks to justify the need for cooling within the residential dwellings in accordance with London Plan Policy SI 4 and Policy CC2 of Camden's Local Plan and where such active cooling sits within the cooling hierarchy of the property.

**Disclaimer**

This report has been prepared based on information in form of documentation, photographs, dimensions, and written explanations that have been made available by the owner and appellant. These have not been checked or verified by Finkernagel Ross. Furthermore, due to a general lack of detailed information, reasonable assumptions had to be made to assess the property's overall services provisions and thermal envelope. The authors of this report do not accept liability for any unintended misinterpretation as a consequence of inaccurate or incomplete information relating to the property.

**Documentation**

This justification statement is to be read in conjunction with existing and proposed drawings (10ANT-000, 10ANT-001, 10ANT-020, 10ANT-030, 10ANT-100, 10ANT-200, 10ANT-300) and the *Acoustic Survey prepared by KP Acoustics*

**Context**

10 Antrim Grove is a semi-detached late Edwardian property located in in the Belsize Park Conservation Area. The property had been extended by a basement excavation in 2013/14 but was substantially destroyed by fire 2016 and subsequently rebuilt in 2017. Apart from the external walls which had stayed intact and have been carefully restored, as well as the basement structure, the whole of the house was reconstructed. As part of this reconstruction, which included all services, the heat pump units for the comfort cooling that are the subject of the enforcement, were installed in 2018.

**Appendix 6 – Independent photographic evidence from Google Maps dated March 2018 and April 2019**

**Appendix 4 – Google Map photographic evidence**

Photo 1 – March 2018



Photo 2 – April 2019





**Appendix 7** – Photographic evidence from complainant dated 29/06/2019 (ref. EN19/0638)



