

**4 LEVERTON STREET,
LONDON,
NW5 2PJ.**

PLANNING STATEMENT

February 2017

SP17-1011

Simply Planning Limited
15 Buckingham Gate
London
SW1E 6LB

Tel: 0207 935 5880
Fax: 0207 935 6144
www.simply-planning.com

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Factual Background.....	3
3. Planning Policy Background	5
4. Summary and Conclusions	13

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared by Simply Planning Limited (SPL) on behalf of Build and Bloom Limited which seeks consent for a ground floor extension, and the realignment of the downstairs lavatory to 4 Leverton Street, London. The property is listed Grade II and in addition to the planning application, listed building consent is also sought.
- 1.2 The proposed development, which would extend the existing kitchen together with the realignment of the kitchen lavatory, would provide a larger open plan kitchen area and allow for additional natural light to enter the property.
- 1.3 The proposed external works include :-
 - Small rear extension to provide an addition 1.08m² of internal floorspace.
 - New rear ground floor elevation to include thin profile aluminium sliding/ bifold glazed doors, with matching rendered blockwork
 - An additional 400mm wide section of glass to the existing conservatory roof.
- 1.4 This Statement explains the proposal and any relevant planning history and then sets and discusses the relevant planning policy context within which these proposals should be judged. Finally, the conclusions are drawn.

2.0 Factual Background

(a) Site and Surrounding Area

- 2.1 4 Leverton Street is located on the eastern side of Leverton Street, approximately 28m from its junction with Leighton Road. It comprises a two-storey Georgian Terraced house. To the rear is a single storey existing extension containing a kitchen/ dining room and lavatory. Beyond the rear extension is a small raised garden.
- 2.2 The property was constructed in the mid-19th Century and is listed Grade II. It falls within the Kentish Town Conservation Area which was designated in 1985 and extended twice, firstly in 1991 and then again in 2011.
- 2.3 Leverton Street is exclusively residential in character comprising almost exclusively of terrace houses.
- 2.4 The site is approximately 3 minutes' walk from Kentish Town Tube Station.

(b) The Proposal

- 2.5 The application seeks consent for the construction of a ground floor extension at the rear of this property, along with alterations to the location of the existing lavatory room. The extension would provide a larger, open plan kitchen. The relocation of the lavatory would provide access via the existing hallway entrance.
- 2.6 Full details of the proposed extension are shown on the following drawings which form part of the application:-

Drawing No.	Title	Scale
SP1	Site Location Plan	1:1250 @A4
1	Existing Layout – Ground Floor	1:50 @A3
2	Proposed Layout – Ground Floor	1:50 @A3
3	Rear Elevations Existing and Proposed	1:50 @A3
4	Section as Proposed	1:50 @A3
5	Section as Existing	1:50 @A3

- 2.7 In addition to the above drawings, the application is also accompanied by:-
- A Heritage Statement, prepared by Simply Planning Limited.
 - A Design and Access Statement prepared by Simply Planning Limited.
- 2.8 The proposed extension would provide in total some 1.08m² (GEA) of additional floorspace. The height of the extension to ridge would be 2.76m where the extension joins the existing rear elevation of the main house. The depth of the extension is 0.6m and its overall width 1.8m.
- 2.9 The proposed extension would provide a rendered blockwork finish consistent with the existing ground floor rear façade.
- 2.10 As part of the application, modifications are also proposed to the ground floor extension by way of new fenestration. This includes the replacement of the existing double hung sash window and double doors located in the rear elevation, with thin profile aluminium sliding/ BiFold glazed doors.
- 2.11 The proposed fenestration change detailed above ensures that the kitchen receives maximum levels of natural daylight.

(C) Planning History

2.12 The Council's Planning Register shows that there have been a total of three previous decisions in respect of the application site.

2.13 On 20th April 2004 an application for the erection of a full width single storey rear extension was refused full planning consent (reference 2003/1976/P). The application was refused for the following two reasons:-

1. **"The proposed ground floor extension is considered to be unacceptable and detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building in terms of scale, bulk, form and detailed design and is, therefore, contrary to policies EN13 (Design of new development), EN22 (Extensions to existing buildings), EN31 (Character and appearance of conservation areas) and EN38 (Preservation of listed buildings) of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000."**
2. **"The proposed extension, by reason of its excessive height and bulk on the boundary of No. 6 Leverton Street, would give rise to an unreasonable sense of enclosure, loss of light and outlook to the detriment of the adjoining residents contrary to policy EN19 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000."**

2.14 Although the proposed full width extension was refused based on its scale, bulk, form and detailed design, a subsequent application for a full width extension was later approved. Details of the application are as follows:-

2.15 On 1st June 2007 an application for the demolition of the existing ground floor extension and the erection of a new ground floor extension was granted full planning consent (reference 2007/2028/P). The application was granted on the basis that:-

"The proposal complies with Camden's SPD design guidance complies with policies B1, B3, B6 and B7 of the UDP, would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is therefore considered acceptable."

2.16 The drawing approved as part of this consent has since been implemented.

2.17 The latest application associated with the application site was for Listed Building consent (reference 2008/2712/L) for the Replacement of the existing timber framed window with timber French doors at ground floor level on the rear elevation. The application was refused for the following reason:-

"The proposed French doors by reason of the loss of the original window, cill and masonry would be detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed building contrary to policy 6 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006."

2.18 It should be noted that the window this application sought to replace was part of the original fabric of the property and was in the main rear wall of the house (as opposed to the later conservatory/ kitchen extension). This proposal only seeks changes to the later, non-original, rear extension.

3. Planning Policy Background

3.1 This section of the Planning Statement outlines the principal national and development plan policies that are relevant to determination of the application proposals. The various policies, along with their significance in determining the application, are discussed in turn below.

(a) National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements

3.2 On 27th March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is augmented by the NPPG which expands on and gives detail to the NPPF's guidance. Both documents are material considerations in the determination of planning applications. They carry significant weight.

3.3 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In this respect, paragraph 7 explains that there are three dimensions to sustainable development; namely economic, social and environmental. Expanding on these dimensions to sustainable development, paragraph 7 continues by explaining:-

- ***"An economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, but ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and co-ordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;***
- ***A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural wellbeing; and***
- ***An environment role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimising ways to pollution and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."***

3.4 In the context of this guidance it is relevant that the application proposals perform both a social and environmental role. First, they will deliver small, but nonetheless important, improvements to this existing terrace house to make it better suited to the needs of both its existing occupier and future occupiers. The property currently comprises a small enclosed kitchen. Modernising existing housing to make it better suited to the needs of today is wholly consistent with the social role of suitable development.

3.5 The proposal also has an environmental dimension. The property is listed Grade II and, as such, is part of our historic environment. The proposed extension has been thoughtfully designed to respect the buildings historic significance whilst offering a modern alternative that would result in a positive enhancement of the building. The proposals, as such, perform an environmental role.

3.6 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF establishes the Government's overarching support and presumption in favour of sustainable development and thereby indicates that:-

"At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking

For decision taking this means:

- ***Approving development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay; and***
- ***Where the Development Plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting planning permission unless:***
 - ***Any adverse impacts in doing so would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole;***
 - ***Specific policies in this Framework indicate that development should be restricted.”***

3.7 As will be demonstrated in this Statement, the application proposals fully accord with Camden’s Core Strategy and therefore, consistent with the above advice, they should be granted consent without delay.

3.8 The NPPF sets out (at paragraph 17) twelve core planning principles which are to underpin plan making and decision taking. The application proposals are consistent with a number of those objectives. Relevant ones are:-

- Not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives.
- Always seek to ensure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.

3.9 The third of the above bullet points is particularly relevant in this case. These proposals are about adapting and improving this existing terrace house to better suit its occupant’s needs whilst respecting and maintaining the historic quality of the building. The present rear extension provides an enclosed kitchen, dining area and lavatory. This proposal seeks to provide a small extension and relocation of the lavatory to open up the kitchen area and thereby make the house more liveable. It does so, however, by extending the house in a modest way at the rear. The proposal also delivers improvements to the property which, although modernises the rear fenestration, does so by using historical scales such as the ridge height and maintaining the existing down pipe. It is important to note that the changes are only proposed to the rear elevation ensuring that there is no adverse impact to the conservation area. In short, this proposal conserves this heritage asset, in a manner that is appropriate to its significance yet helps to adapt the property so it is more suitable to today’s occupant and indeed occupants in the future. It is exactly what the NPPF urges.

3.10 The NPPF’s advice on conserving and enhancing the historic environment appears in paragraphs 126 to 141. Paragraphs 131 and 132 set out the approach to determining planning applications that affect a heritage asset. They indicate that:-

“131. In determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of:-

- ***The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;***
- ***The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and***
- ***The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.***

132. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As Heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a Grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably Scheduled Monuments, protected wrecks, battlefields, Grade I and II* listed buildings, Grade I and II* registered park and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional."

3.11 In the context of this advice, these proposals:-

- Do not result in the loss of a heritage asset or, indeed, part of that asset. The proposal merely seeks to alter the existing rear elevation which is not in fact part of the original dwelling. The addition is carried out in a wholly sympathetic manner to the retained heritage asset.

3.12 As such, the proposals are, we consider, wholly consistent with this advice. Even if they were not, and if it was considered the proposal did harm the heritage asset in any way (we do not believe it does), any perceived level of harm could not be described as significant. In that scenario paragraph 134 would apply. It indicates that:-

"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use."

3.13 As we say, this proposal does not, in our opinion, result in any harm to the heritage asset but rather leads to positive benefits. Even, however, if harm were considered to arise from the proposed extension, it could not be described as substantial. It would be very slight harm if any. In that scenario the benefits of the proposal, most notably in securing 'the optimum viable use' of the building would fully outweigh any small perceived disbenefit. Therefore, even if harm is considered to arise the requirements of the NPPF would still be met.

3.14 In summary, we conclude that the proposal is wholly acceptable in terms of the NPPF's advice that deals with heritage assets and, more generally, with the whole thrust of the NPPF. It therefore gains the NPPF's support.

3.15 Relevant policies at local level, which form part of the Local Development Framework, are provided by Camden's Core Strategy, adopted in 2010 and by the Development Policies Document. On the Council's Proposals Map the site is shown to be within the designated Kentish Town Conservation Area.

3.16 The Core Strategy is, by its nature, of a strategic nature and accordingly its policies are only of broad relevance to these detailed proposals. That said, Policy CS14 is concerned with promoting high quality places and conserving the Borough's heritage and indicates that:-

"The Council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use"

3.17 The most relevant points of this policy include:-

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character; and***
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens.***

- 3.18 This policy is wholly consistent with the NPPF's advice on protecting heritage assets and, as we detail above, these proposals are consistent with that advice and indeed Policy CS14 itself. The proposals have been carefully designed so as to protect the significance of this designated heritage asset. Moreover, they deliver clear benefits to the heritage asset through enhancements in natural lighting and better living arrangements.
- 3.19 The Council's Development Management Policies Document was also adopted in November 2010 with Policy DP25, again concerned with heritage assets. It indicates that:-

"DP25 – Conserving Camden's Heritage

Conservation areas - In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will:

a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;

b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;

c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;

d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and

e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

Listed buildings - To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

e) prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;

f) only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and

g) not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building

- 3.20 These proposals are again wholly consistent with this advice. To ensure the proposal is consistent with Policy DP25 each of the above points has been addressed in turn below:-
- 3.21 ***a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;***
- 3.22 The Kentish Town Conservation Area was designated in 1985 and has been extended twice, firstly in 1991 and then again in 2011. The Council has produced a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which offers a conservation appraisal followed by how the conservation area should be managed.
- 3.23 As part of this proposal, the Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy has been carefully addressed, including the points covered within section 5;

Spatial analysis - As the proposed extension is modest in size and sits to the rear of the property, there would be no impact on the townscape value the streets or spatial arrangement of the Kentish Town Conservation Area.

Key views – Leverton St does not fall within the protected views from Parliament Hill to St Paul’s Cathedral. As such, key views would not be impacted as part of this proposed development.

Character zones - As the proposed extension is modest in size and sits to the rear of the property, there would be no impact on the Leverton Road Character Zone which maintains Leverton Street’s coloured stucco houses with narrow front gardens.

Land use activity and influence of uses – The proposed development does not propose a change of use of the residential property. As such, land use activity would not be affected by this proposal.

The quality of buildings and their contribution to the area – The prominent house type in the Kentish Town Conservation Area consists of terrace house, including Leverton St. The proposed extension to the rear of the property would maintain the built form therefore not harm, in any way, the character of the area.

Local details – The Conservation Area originally consisted of windows and doors that were timber, panelled, and painted with individual designs. Although many originals survive, poor replacements can have the effect of eroding the quality of the area. The existing windows and doors to the rear of 4 Leverton Street are not the originals. The proposed thin profile aluminium sliding/ bifold glazed doors, although a modern approach, do not try to poorly mimic the original fenestration, but instead provide a character of its own. It is an improvement and accepted design approach for extensions of this type.

Prevalent local and traditional materials and the public realm – The proposed development does not seek consent that would affect the traditional paving of Leverton Street, nor does it proposed any form of signage. The proposed works are concentrated to the ground floor level to the rear of the property.

The character and appearance of green spaces – the proposed development does not require the removal of any trees, nor does the modest proposed rear extension have any effect on the existing front garden of the property.

Audit of heritage assets – 4 Leverton Street is a Grade II Listed Building that adds a positive contribution to Leverton Street and the Kentish Town Conservation area as a whole. This proposal does not seek any development or changes to the front façade of the property. As such, the modest ground floor rear extension would not have a negative impact upon the Conservation Area.

- 3.24 ***b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;***
- 3.25 A modest rear extension would not detract from the character or the appearance of the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The proposals are located to the ground floor to the rear of the property and would not be seen from any public viewpoint. They would both preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- 3.26 ***c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;***
- 3.27 The proposal includes works to a Listed Building within the Kentish Town Conservation Area. Therefore, this statement is not applicable. Although not applicable, it is worth stating that the proposal does not seek the approval of total or substantial demolition of the Grade II Listed Building.

- 3.28 ***d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and***
- 3.29 The proposal is located within the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The citation is not relevant.
- 3.30 ***e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden’s architectural heritage.***
- 3.31 The proposed development does not seek the removal of any trees, nor does the proposed rear extension reduce, harm or affect the properties rear garden.
- 3.32 ***Listed buildings - To preserve or enhance the borough’s listed buildings, the Council will:***
- 3.33 ***e) prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;***
- 3.34 This proposal does not seek the approval of total or substantial demolition of the Grade II Listed Building. The works proposed include a modest rear ground floor extension to the existing extension. The proposal will not result in the loss of this heritage asset.
- 3.35 ***f) only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and***
- 3.36 This citation is not applicable. The proposal does not seek change of use.
- 3.37 ***g) not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building***
- 3.38 The proposals seeks approval for a modest rear extension and alteration to the location of the ground floor lavatory. This will improve natural light and provide additional space, enhancing the living arrangement of the Listed Building. The siting and design of the extension replicates the floor plans of other properties in the street such as No 2 others No 12 Leverton Street which have already been extended in a similar manner. The materials used would include aluminium and rendered blockwork, this is again in character with existing and adjacent properties ensuring the effect on the Listed Building and its setting is minimal.
- 3.39 Policy DP24 is concerned with the requirements for securing high-quality design. It indicates that the ‘*Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design*’. It then establishes a series of criteria against which such proposals will be judged. Relevant criteria include:-
- (i) Character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings
- 3.40 The modest rear extension would mirror, in respect of its scale/ setting/form, the existing rear extension to no. 2 Leverton Street (next door). Therefore the proposed extension would be of an acceptable scale given the grant of permission for no.2 Leverton Street (planning ref 2010/6180/P).
- 3.41 The proposed extension would only be noticeable from the rear of no 6 Leverton street, this is a result of the proposed extension being located adjacent the boundary of No 6. Although the proposed extension would be seen, the impact of the extension is expected to be minimal due to the new extension measuring a total of 0.38m above the original extension roofline along the boundary of No. 6.

3.42 The character of the proposed rear extension with respect to the materials used would match that of the existing and neighbouring properties given the proposed materials consist of rendered blockwork and aluminium profiling. The use of large aluminium framed windows to the rear of no 2 also match the window plain aluminium boarder being proposed for the rear doors of the proposed extension.

(ii) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed

3.43 The proposed extension would follow the roof profiling of the existing extension, ensuring that the proportion of the proposed extension is within the proportions already set by the existing building.

3.44 The internal works, would not change the dimensions of the existing ground floor lavatory, the proposal merely seeks to realign the lavatory to ensure the rear of the property provides better living arrangements for current and future occupiers.

3.45 With regards to the existing character of the property, the proposal entails the removal of the existing window and double doors at ground floor level with a new larger opening consisting of bi folding doors. Although the opening and design of the proposed bi-folding doors do not match that of the existing extension, the large opening is similar of that of no 2 Leverton Street.

3.46 The officers report (planning ref 2010/6180/P), for the rear elevation of no 2 Leverton Street, concluded that, *'the alterations to the rear of the application site will not be visible from the public realm as the rear of the property is screened by the three storey terraced properties at No's 7-13 Leighton Rand and a row of trees along the side boundary of No. 1 Maud Wilkes Close. Therefore the impact of the enlarged rear extension and new window in relation to the character and appearance of the listed building and the conservation area is considered to be minor'*.

3.47 In light of the comments made in the officer's report for no 2 Leverton Street, it is be reasonable to conclude that this proposal's impact on the listed building and conservation area should also be considered minor.

(iii) the quality of materials to be used

3.48 Again, the proposals are consistent with this guidance. The detailing of the proposal mirrors that adopted on the neighbouring properties. The rendered blockwork, either side and above the proposed sliding door, will match the existing ground floor façade. The use of thin profile aluminium for the sliding/ BiFold glazed doors would match the material used as part of the extension for the windows at No.2 Leverton Street.

3.49 The proposal, as such, both accords with the established design principles of the profiling of original materials as well as materials used in recent approved extensions adjacent no 4 Leverton St.

3.50 Policy DP26 is concerned with managing the impact of development of occupiers and neighbours. It indicates that *'the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity'*. It then establishes a series of criteria against which such proposals will be judged. Relevant criteria include:-

- Visual privacy and Overlooking
- Overshadowing and Outlook
- Sunlight, Daylight and artificial light levels
- An acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangement, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space;

- 3.51 The proposal is modest in scale and will not have an unacceptable impact in terms of any of these criteria on the amenities of nearby neighbours. There will be no impact in terms of sunlight and daylighting and the only outlook is from the sliding doors which are confined to the rear elevation of the proposed extension. The roof ridge of the extension would not protrude any higher than the highest part of the existing extension.
- 3.52 The internal arrangement of the proposal would provide 1.08m² of additional floor space ensuring the internal arrangement of the listed property work far better for existing and future residents of no 4 Leverton Street.
- 3.53 Accordingly, we conclude that in the context of the adopted policies of the Council's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document, the proposal is wholly consistent with the relevant policies. Accordingly, on the basis the proposal accords with the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan, planning and listed building consent can and should be granted.

4. Summary and Conclusions

- 4.1 This proposal seeks consent for a modest extension to the existing rear addition of this property, as well as the relocation of the ground floor lavatory, in order to provide additional floorspace and an improved the internal kitchen layout. It is, as we say, a modest extension and alteration but nonetheless an important extension which will make the property better suited to the needs of its present occupier and future occupiers.
- 4.2 The building is listed Grade II and, as such, a designed heritage asset. The proposal has, therefore, had regard to the significance of that heritage asset and has responded in a clear and positive way to detailed national and local planning policy. The proposed extension, as such:-
- Is modest in scale.
 - Respects and is subservient to the main host building so that the main house remains the dominant feature. It achieves this by ensuring the proposed extension does not extend above the existing ground floor extension.
 - In plan form the extension repeats the plan form of similar rear extensions within the conservation area such as no. 2 and 12 Leverton Street.
 - The proposed extension is confined to the rear of the property and would be little seen, if at all, from the remainder of the Conservation Area. The proposed extension and internal layout would not have significant harmful impact on the wider character of the area.
- 4.3 The relevant policies both at national level and Local Plan level do not preclude extensions to heritage assets such as this. Rather they require that they should be sympathetic and have a detailed understanding of the significance of the heritage asset. This proposal, through its careful design, accords with this advice and would not result in any harm whatsoever to this designated heritage asset. Rather it would lead to enhancements to the heritage asset. In these circumstances, in heritage terms, the proposal can be supported.
- 4.4 Moreover, the proposal is consistent with the other Development Plan policies at local level and with the NPPF's general support for sustainable development. It would deliver a modest extension to this existing house which will make it better suited to the needs of the present occupier and occupiers in the future. It is sustainable development which is consistent with the Development Plan and, as such, consistent with paragraph 14 of the NPPF, therefore it should be granted planning and listed building consent.