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Lynne Young
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2 The Square

Bristol, BS1 6PN

Dear Lynne Young,

**Appeal by: Mr & Mrs Lyndsay and Ryan Nuttall and Greenwood**

**Site Address: 46 Alma Street, LONDON, NW5 3DH**

**Application proposals: Construction of a part single, part two storey rear extension.**

**Summary**

The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace house, small in scale and width, with a butterfly roof; it falls within the Inkerman Conservation Area and is listed as a positive contributor.

Planning permission (reference: **2015/1354/P)** was refused on the 28/05/2015 for a part single, part two storey rear extension on the following grounds:

The proposed extension, by reason of its height, width, design, bulk and the materials used, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider terrace, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Inkerman Conservation Area. Therefore, it would be contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

**New Issues Introduced**

The only new issue introduced is personal circumstances. The applicant has stated that they are trying to enlarge their home for the needs of the family, medical and financial justifications are also included. The circumstances put forward are not material planning considerations and cannot be taken into account in the decision making process.

The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset (the conservation area) as per paragraphs 134 of the NPPF and there are no public benefits to outweigh this harm. The appeal site has already secured its optimum viable use as a single family dwellinghouse.

I also note that the appendix from the architect makes several references to officer emails which have not been included in documents sent by PINS.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Roe

Planning Officer

Culture and Environment