

**GROUNDS OF APPEAL AGAINST A REFUSAL OF
 permission at :-
 10 GOLDHURST TERRACE SOUTH HAMPSTEAD
 NW6 3HU Planning application 2013/1447/P**

INTRODUCTION

This is an appeal against a refusal of permission to erect a skylight in the roof to illuminate the topmost floor.

- 1 The relevant background is set out in the Design and Access Statement which accompanied the application.
- 2 The proposal is to utilise the existing loft space by introducing electronically operated sliding glass panes which are set back within the existing roof lines. This avoids the overlooking which would occur if conventional dormer windows were used.
- 3 The panes would be set back to maintain the existing roof line and the light provided and consequent ventilation which would be then be possible. Coupled with the installation of appropriate blinds the possibility of creating light pollution would be avoided.

GROUNDS FOR REFUSAL

4 General planning issues The proposal will not invade the privacy of neighbouring properties due to the geometry of the proposal (I have marked up in pencil on the relevant cross section in pencil to show this) I append as an appendix, 2 sheets of photographs of buildings the local area where the policy has not been applied. I consider the refusal to be one where the planning authority is challenging government policy.

I would concede that the decision rests on policies D24 and D25 that incorporate these major decisions.

5 Policy DP24 Securing high quality design

6 Ground for refusal DP 24 lists several considerations a) to i) of which with the exception of a) to c) & h) do not apply)

a) This sub paragraph seems to apply to new extensions or substantial alterations, and not to this proposal which is a minor consideration. I see that the planning authority has not applied this policy to a large number of local situations of buildings of the same

period and style. I have referred above to a number of exceptions and would like the inspector or case officer to examine at least 3 of them.

b) A similar point can be made as in the previous paragraph. The proportions of the retained building are not altered nor the basic character changed. It is a comparatively small change compared to the more substantial change represented by the escape stairs to the very same property approved under 2010/090/P and to the recently approved scheme 12/63320/P for a major refurbishment of the property.

c) No discussion of the proposed materials has taken place in the numerous meetings that have been held. This is a new point which can be dealt with by applying a condition to the permission (if granted) requiring submission of details prior to work commencing.

h) The proposal could be seen as an attempt to make good the lack of access to the rear yard, should the proposed spiral stair not be built.

7 DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage.

Policy on Conservation Areas has a number of points a) to e) of which the points c) to e) do not apply.

a) The character given by the insertion of skylights permitted elsewhere which is accepted as necessary so glazing panes will be within the slope of the existing roof and at the same angle as required by Section 7.16 of the South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy dated Feb 2011.

b) I submit that the proposal accords with the character of the remaining house and the general conservation area. The upgrading of the top floor is intended to make up for the lack of access to the albeit small rear yard. (enjoyed by the lower flats) and to bring the house up to the modern standards that national housing policy is beginning to demand.

For the above reasons the Inspector is respectfully requested to grant the necessary permission.