

Title

Appeal Statement of Case

Project

34 Ingham Road, London NW6
London Borough of Camden ref 2017/6848

Date

July 2018



Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Background to the Appeal	2
Planning history	3
Current situation	3
3. Planning Policy Context	5
Development Plan	5
Material Considerations	5
4. Appeal Site and Surroundings	7
Appeal site	7
Surroundings	8
Overview	10
5. Assessment of Appeal Scheme	11
Differences between the two schemes	11
Previous appeal decision	12
Siting, scale, bulk and design	12
Neighbour Amenity	17
Overview	18
6. Conclusions	19

Appendices

in a separate document

1. Introduction

1.1. This Statement of Case (the Statement) is submitted by Verve Planning (the agent) in accordance with Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, on behalf of Mr William Jeffery (the applicant and appellant).

1.2. The Statement relates to an appeal against a decision of London Borough of Camden (the council) to refuse planning application ref 2017/6848 (the application) at 34 Ingham Road, London NW6 (the site) for:

Installation of rear dormer roof extension and 'pod' roof extension above part of two storey rear addition (Retrospective).

1.3. A site location plan is included in **Appendix 1**.

1.4. The decision notice for 2017/6848 is included in **Appendix 2**. The reason for refusal is:

The rear dormer roof extension and 'pod' roof extension, by reason of its siting, scale, bulk and design, are an overwhelming and incongruous addition, harming the original roof form and character and appearance of the host building contrary to policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and policy 2 (Design and Character) of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

1.5. This Statement sets out the written representations on behalf of the appellant in support of the appeal scheme, justifying why permission should be granted for the retrospective scheme.

1.6. The remainder of this Statement is set out as follows:

- Section 2 Background to the appeal;
- Section 3 Planning policy context;
- Section 4 Appraisal of appeal site and surroundings;
- Section 5 Assessment of appeal scheme; and
- Section 6 Conclusion.

2. Background to the Appeal

- 2.1. This mid terrace house was built in the late 1800s on the northern side of Ingham Road. It originally comprised accommodation on the ground and first floors, including a two storey stepped outtrigger to the rear.
- 2.2. A large flat roof dormer window was subsequently built on the rear roof slope by previous owner, as shown **below**:



Planning history

- 2.3. The house has been extended again to suit the current owner's family's needs, whilst respecting the character of the host building and surrounding area, as well as respecting neighbours' amenity.
- 2.4. A summary of the more recent planning history is as follows:
- 2009/1968/P – Erection of a single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse. Certificate of lawfulness (proposed) - Refused 17/07/2009;
 - 2009/3915/P – Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to residential dwelling (Class C3) - Planning permission granted 06/10/2009. The scheme has been built out;
 - 2014/5311/P – Proposed rear dormer to replace existing and rooflights to front roofslope - Certificate of lawfulness (proposed) granted 30/09/2014. The scheme was not built out.
 - 2015/7260/P – Erection of rear dormer roof extension and "pod" roof extension above part of two storey rear addition - Certificate of lawfulness (proposed) granted 04/05/2016;
 - 2016/5069/P - Alterations to the rear elevation at second floor level, including the creation of a roof terrace above two storey outrigger enclosed by new balustrade and privacy screens, and replacement of existing rear dormer window with a door – Refused 02/02/2017 – Appeal dismissed 27/04/2017 (PINS ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3170357). The structures have since been removed by the owner; and
 - 2017/6848/P - Installation of rear dormer roof extension and 'pod' roof extension above part of two storey rear addition (Retrospective). Refused 10/05/2018. This scheme has been built out and is the subject of the appeal.

Current situation

- 2.5. During the build process of the rear dormer roof extension and "pod" roof extension (LDC ref 2015/7260/P), several changes were incorporated into the scheme that deviated from the drawings approved under the LDC (2015/7260/P) (included in **Appendix 3**). These included: different rear facing door and window designs to the bathroom and bedroom; addition of a shallow sloped roof to the pod extension for drainage purposes; addition of a small projection at the bottom of the pod (on the west side) to accommodate the wooden floor joists; and a slightly higher dormer extension to allow for suitable internal head height.

- 2.6. A comparison of the two schemes is illustrated in the overlay drawing of the rear elevation included in **Appendix 4**. The pink overlay is the approved LDC scheme and the black is as constructed.
- 2.7. The differences between the two schemes are explained in more detail in Section 5.
- 2.8. Following correspondence from the council, a retrospective application (ref 2017/6848/P) was submitted in December 2017 to try and regularise the situation. The drawings for the application are included in **Appendix 5**. No representations from neighbours or local amenity groups were submitted to the council. The application was refused under delegated powers on 10 May 2018. The decision notice is included in **Appendix 2**. Therefore, an appeal has been submitted.
- 2.9. The Inspector is advised that a planning officer did not carry out a site visit to the appeal property when determining the retrospective planning application 2017/6848/P. It is not known how the officer could make a valid planning assessment without visiting the property. This is poor practice and we request a response from the council on this matter.

Substituted drawings

- 2.10. Three revised drawings are now included in the appeal submission that the Council and Inspector are requested to accept as drawings to be determined. They are included as separate submissions via the PINS Casework Portal but they are also included in **Appendix 6**. The changes comprise:
- Constructed Floor Plans drawing number 101, July 2018 replaces Constructed Floor Plans drawing number 006, December 2017 (the change relates to the Second Floor Plan);
 - Constructed Rear Elevation drawing number 102, July 2018 replaces Constructed Rear Elevation drawing number 008, December 2017; and
 - Constructed Side Elevation drawing number 103, July 2018 replaces Constructed Side Elevation drawing number 008, December 2017.
- 2.11. These drawings correctly show the built position of the second floor bathroom window, the sloped roof of the pod extension and the flashing detail to the party wall adjacent to the pod. The discrepancies were not picked up by the council during determination of the retrospective application.

3. Planning Policy Context

- 3.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 explains that determination of applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development Plan

- 3.2. Of relevance to this appeal, the development plan documents comprise the London Plan (March 2016), the Camden Local Plan (July 2017) and the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (September 2015).
- 3.3. The officer's report notes the following Local Plan policies:
- A1 - Managing the impact of development; and
 - D1 – Design.
- 3.4. Only policy D1 is cited in the reason for refusal set out on the decision notice (Appendix 2).
- 3.5. The officer's report also notes the following Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan policy which is cited in the reason for refusal:
- Policy 2 (Design and Character)
- 3.6. The officer's report refers to the London Plan but does not include any policies and none are cited in the reason for refusal.

Material Considerations

- 3.7. Camden Planning Guidance is a material consideration. The officer's report refers to the following guidance:
- CPG 1 – Design (July 2015, updated March 2018); and
 - CPG 6 – Amenity (September 2011, updated March 2018).
- 3.8. Neither planning guidance documents are cited in the reason for refusal
- 3.9. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration. Again, it is not cited in the reason for refusal. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF explains that decision takers should approve development that accords with the development plan without delay.

- 3.10. Section 5 of this Statement assesses the appeal scheme against the above policies and guidance. It concludes that the scheme complies with the Development Plan and planning permission should be granted.

4. Appeal Site and Surroundings

- 4.1. The application was refused by the Council because it was considered that the rear dormer roof extension and 'pod' roof extension, by reason of its siting, scale, bulk and design, are an overwhelming and incongruous addition, harming the original roof form and character and appearance of the host building.
- 4.2. The reason for refusal does not extend to the wider surroundings.
- 4.3. This section appraises the host building, as well as the wider terrace and surroundings for completeness.

Appeal site

- 4.4. The site comprises a terraced house on the north side of Ingham Road, originally built in the late 1800s and extended over time. It has a rear courtyard garden.
- 4.5. The property is not in a conservation area and it is not listed. There are no TPO trees on the site.
- 4.6. The site is within easy walking distance of shops and other local facilities.
- 4.7. Current photographs of the rear of the appeal property are included **below and overleaf**.





- 4.8. NB The flue to the wood burner was installed in 2010 (ie more than four years ago) and the council accepts that this is lawful.
- 4.9. It should be noted that the reason for refusal only relates to the host building, however the surroundings are described below to provide some context.

Surroundings

- 4.10. Most of the houses on Ingham Road have roof conversions and extensions. Photographs (**below and overleaf**) of the rear of houses on the north side of the road (near to the appeal property) illustrate the very mixed character and appearance of these extensions, in terms of siting, scale, bulk and design. The rear outriggers are not viewed as a uniform feature along the terrace any more due to the wide variety of extensions surrounding them.





- 4.11. In particular, the council's planning history indicates that neighbouring 32 Ingham Road has been extended, as follows:
- PSX0204672 – Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Development to convert the loft into habitable space, including the erection of a full width rear dormer and the installation of 4 roof lights on the front slope of the roof - Certificate of lawfulness (proposed) granted 16/06/2003; and

- 2014/7565/P – Erection of a single storey rear infill extension and changes to the windows at first floor and second floor level on the rear elevation - Planning permission granted 16/02/2015.

4.12. Neighbouring 36A Ingham Road (upper flat) has also been extended, as follows:

- (2016/6886/P – Extend rear dormer, create second floor terrace, enlarge window & door opening to existing first floor balcony, replace existing casement windows with double hung sash windows – Planning Permission granted 17/02/2017.

Overview

- 4.13. The host building has already been extended with a contemporary style ground floor rear extension. There was also previously a large rear dormer window on the rear roof slope, as shown on the image in section 2.
- 4.14. The photographs in this section also confirm that the rear of properties on the north side of Ingham Road have all been extended in some form or other at upper levels and are very mixed in character and appearance.
- 4.15. There is still scope to successfully integrate new extensions (such as the appeal scheme) onto the host building and also into the wider eclectic roofscape.
- 4.16. An assessment of how the extension sits comfortably on the host building is included in Section 5. It concludes that the scheme does not harm the original roof form or character and appearance of the host building and complies with Local Plan policy D1 (Design) and Neighbourhood Plan policy 2 (Design and Character).

5. Assessment of Appeal Scheme

- 5.1. This section assesses the differences between the LDC scheme (2015/7260/P) and the appeal scheme (as constructed) (2017/6848/P). The differences are very minor.
- 5.2. This Section then assesses the appeal scheme against the policies cited in the reason for refusal, (namely policy D1 of the Local Plan and policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan), as well as other material considerations.
- 5.3. It concludes that overall **siting**, **scale**, **bulk** and **design** are acceptable. There is a very varied roofscape and therefore the appeal scheme does not disrupt a uniform rear building line of the terrace. Instead, the appeal scheme manages to integrate into the host building in a sympathetic manner and it does not impact adversely on neighbours' amenity.

Differences between the two schemes

- 5.4. A comparison of the two schemes is illustrated in the overlay plan in **Appendix 4**.
- 5.5. The changes comprise:
- Slightly different siting and shape of the bathroom opening. It is now a door (but on a catch to prevent stepping out onto the roof) that sits centrally on the pod façade. The principle of a door design here was accepted by officers in the report for application 2016/5069/P;
 - Slightly larger bedroom window and insertion of a glazed Juliette balcony;
 - Inclusion of a shallow pitch to the pod extension roof to allow for drainage, resulting in a slight increase in the height (by approximately 25 cm rising to approximately 45 cm adjacent to the party wall);
 - Addition of a small projection running along the bottom of the pod (on the west side) measuring approximately 35cm wide, 40cm high and 350cm long to accommodate wooden floors joists; and
 - A slight increase in the height of the dormer (by approximately 20 cm) to allow for suitable internal head height.
- 5.6. A comparison of the two schemes is illustrated in two further drawings of the rear and side elevations included in **Appendix 7**. The pink shaded areas show the additional built form as constructed, over and above the approved LDC scheme.

- 5.7. The changes are barely noticeable in the overall composition of the host building, and indeed no neighbours contacted the council complaining about them.
- 5.8. The extra volume has come about due to building practicalities. The appellant has not benefitted from any extra space arising from the differences between the approved LDC scheme and the constructed appeal scheme.

Previous appeal decision

- 5.9. An appeal decision relating to a previous application at the appeal property (LPA ref 2016/5069/P and PINS ref PP/X5210/D/17/3170357) is included at **Appendix 8**.
- 5.10. That scheme was for “alterations to the rear elevation at second floor level, including the creation of a roof terrace above the two storey outrigger enclosed by new balustrade and privacy screens, and replacement of existing rear dormer window with a door”.
- 5.11. The current appeal scheme was already in situ at that time too.
- 5.12. The 2016/5069/P appeal was dismissed due to the proposed timber privacy screens (that had not yet been erected) detracting from the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings. The other elements that had already been erected (ie flat surface to form the roof terrace and balustrades) have since been removed.
- 5.13. When considering the raising of the outer edge of the outrigger to form a flat surface (part of the appeal scheme 2016/5069/P), the Inspector noted the following at paragraph 6:

‘Given that the property has been subject to major changes, and has not been identified as a heritage asset or in a conservation area, I consider that this further relatively minor alteration would not be unduly out of keeping with the house or its surroundings’.

- 5.14. The fact that a previous inspector noted that the property has already been subject to ‘major changes’, and that the property was not identified as a heritage asset or in a conservation area, is an important consideration.

Siting, scale, bulk and design

Compliance with Local Plan

- 5.15. One of the policies cited in the reason for refusal is Local Plan policy D1 - Design.
- 5.16. The policy states that ‘The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development’. It goes on to list 15 requirements (a-o). This Statement considers them individually below. The appeal scheme complies with policy D1, as follows:

- a) The development respects local context and character. The local context and character is very mixed. It should be noted that the policy does not require development to 'mimic' or 'copy' the local context or character. The site is not within a conservation area and the terrace is not listed, therefore the council presumably does not consider that the local context and character warrants any heritage designation;
- b) This bullet is not relevant as the site is not within or adjacent to heritage assets;
- c) The development is sustainable in design and construction, incorporating best practice in resource management and climate change mitigation and adaptation;
- d) The development is of sustainable and durable construction and adaptable to different activities and land uses;
- e) The details and materials are of high quality and 'complement' the local character. Again the requirement is not to 'mimic' or 'copy'. The muted colours help the extensions recede back into the roof and are very similar to those used on the ground floor extension;
- f) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns streets, open spaces, movement and street frontages;
- g) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns inclusiveness and accessibility for all and is aimed more at public buildings;
- h) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns health;
- i) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns security, crime and antisocial behaviour;
- j) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns natural features, gardens and other open space;
- k) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns hard and soft landscape design and public art;
- l) This bullet is not relevant as it concerns outdoor amenity space;
- m) The development does not exceed the highest part of the roof and it preserves strategic and local views;
- n) The development results in a high standard of accommodation; and
- o) The development carefully integrates building services equipment (pipework and vents etc).

5.17. The above assessment against the requirements a – o concludes that the scheme complies with policy D1 of the Local Plan.

5.18. Turning to paragraph 7.2 of the supporting text to policy D1 (under the heading 'Local context and character'), we comment as follows. The wording notes that 'The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design' and it also notes that it 'will expect developments to consider' nine bullet points. The use of the word 'consider' is important. It does not state 'must match', for example.

5.19. This Statement demonstrates that the design team considered all the relevant bullets in policy D1 below. The appeal scheme complies with the policy, as follows:

- The development considers the character, setting, context and the form and scale of

neighbouring buildings. At roof level, the neighbouring buildings all differ in form and scale. Therefore the character, setting and context is mixed and can accommodate the appeal scheme without harm;

- Although larger than other roof extensions, the appeal still scheme respects the character and proportions of the existing host building. The pod extension is set well back from the building edge and the colour palette matches the ground floor and ensures that the extension recedes into the house;
- As mentioned above, the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development is varied and the appeal scheme manages to integrate into its surroundings successfully;
- There is a variety of roof extensions along the terrace, resulting in a lack of rhythm, symmetry or uniformity in the townscape, even before the appeal scheme was constructed;
- The main rear elevation at ground and first floor levels are unchanged. The change is only at roof level and is set back from the rear façade in a muted colour scheme, so it recedes back in the roof;
- The design of the extension is ideal for its intended use as a bedroom and ensuite bathroom for the owners/occupiers;
- This bullet is not relevant as it concerns inclusive design and accessibility and is aimed at public buildings and places;
- This bullet is not relevant as it concerns public realm and its impact on views and vistas; and
- This bullet is not relevant as it concerns the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value. The appeal site is not adjacent to any.

5.20. The appeal scheme therefore complies with all the relevant bullets in paragraph 7.2, as demonstrated above.

5.21. Paragraph 7.3 of the supporting text to Policy D1 states that 'The Council will welcome high quality contemporary design which responds to its context, however there are some places of homogenous architectural style (for example Georgian Squares) where it is important to retain it'. The appeal scheme is high quality and an unashamedly contemporary design, to match the style of the ground floor extension. The rear of Ingham Road properties do not form a 'homogenous architectural style' (as illustrated in the photographs in this Statement), and it is asserted that the terrace can accommodate the proposed development successfully.

5.22. Paragraph 7.4 of the supporting text to Policy D1 states: 'Good design takes account of its surroundings and preserves what is distinctive and valued about the local area. Careful consideration of the characteristics of a site, features of local distinctiveness and the wider context is needed in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Character is about people and communities as well as the physical

components'. As explained above, the surrounding roofscape and character is extremely varied and there are no longer features of local distinctiveness. The appeal scheme successfully integrates into its surroundings.

- 5.23. The appeal scheme responds 'creatively' to its site and its context, as encouraged in paragraph 7.5. In accordance with paragraph 7.10, the scheme incorporates materials of a high quality that are durable and visually attractive and fit in with the ground floor extension. The texture of the tiles, along with their dark colour and tone, are compatible with the existing materials of the house and those of neighbours and ensure that the extension recedes into the roof. The tiles are very similar to some used on neighbouring properties and overall they complement the building composition.
- 5.24. As demonstrated above, the siting, scale, bulk and design of the extension is acceptable in this varied roofscape and accords with policy D1 of the Local Plan.

Compliance with Neighbourhood Plan

- 5.25. The second policy cited in the reason for refusal is Neighbourhood Plan policy 2 – Design and Character.
- 5.26. The policy states that 'All development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead'. It goes on to list 10 ways that this shall be achieved by. The appeal scheme complies with the bullets, as follows:
- i. The first bullet is not relevant as it relates to the interface with the street and streetscape. The extension is on the rear of the building, away from the street;
 - ii. The design of the appeal scheme maintains the positive contribution to the character of the existing buildings and structures;
 - iii. The third bullet is not relevant, as it relates to creating a positive relationship between buildings and street level activity. Again, the extension is on the rear, away from the street;
 - iv. The form, function, structure (including the scale and mass) are acceptable in this location and do not harm the mixed surroundings. It is important to note that the pod extension is set well back from the building edge;
 - v. The muted colour palette harmonises with the existing materials of the host property and the neighbouring properties and ensures the extensions recede back into the roof;
 - vi. The third bullet is not relevant as it relates to tall buildings;
 - vii. The extensions is in character and in proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. No neighbours have objected and the council accepts that there is no adverse impact on neighbour amenity;
 - viii. This bullet is not relevant as it relates to public realm;

- ix. Again, this bullet is not relevant as Ingham Road is not within an identified local view;
- x. The development aims to fulfil the criteria set out in Building for Life 12 (especially the Connections and Character criteria).

Compliance with London Plan

- 5.27. Although not cited in the reason for refusal, the proposal complies with London Plan policy 7.4 (Local Character) and policy 7.6 (Architecture). In terms of policy 7.4, the development has regard to the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings and provides a high quality design. London Plan policy 7.6 says that architecture should incorporate the highest quality materials and designs appropriate to its context. Again, the proposal complies with this policy, as explained above.

Compliance with CPG

- 5.28. Although not cited in the reason for refusal, the proposal complies with CPG1 (Design). The document advises that roof alterations should be sympathetic and do not harm the character and appearance of buildings.
- 5.29. It is important to note that paragraph 5.7 of the CPG states that additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where there are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm. This is the case at the appeal property as there is a variety of roof alterations on the north side of Ingham Road.

Compliance with the NPPF

- 5.30. Again, although not cited in the reason for refusal, the proposal complies with the policies in the NPPF. The NPPF states as a core planning principle (paragraph 17) that planning should “always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings”. It also states (paragraph 56) that “good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people”.
- 5.31. Importantly, paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions ‘should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.’ The appeal scheme adds interest and contributes to the natural evolution and mixture of the area. It respects key design principles, is high quality and respects its neighbours and the overall design of the ground floor extension.

- 5.32. There are several examples of roof extensions near to the appeal site where a contemporary design approach has been taken.

Neighbour Amenity

- 5.33. Turning to neighbour amenity, the officer's report confirms that:

'It is considered that the proposal would not result in undue harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.'

- 5.34. The appeal scheme complies with policy A1 of the Local Plan (Managing the impact of development) and CPG6 (Amenity). The matter is not in dispute with the council.

- 5.35. Policy A1 states that the council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours and that they will grant permission for development unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity. The factors the policy assesses and that are relevant to the appeal scheme include:

- visual privacy, outlook; and
- sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.

- 5.36. It should be noted that the rear bathroom door is partly obscure glazed to prevent any overlooking (as show in the photo **below**). The design of this door has already been accepted by the council.



- 5.37. The rear bedroom window has a Juliette balcony (no terrace) and does not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking to the neighbouring property (as show in the photo

below). The separation distance to the property at the rear is extensive and no overlooking would occur.



- 5.38. It is also important to note that no objections have been received from neighbours following consultation on the proposal.

Overview

- 5.39. Given the above assessment, the rear dormer roof extension and 'pod' roof extension are not overwhelming or incongruous additions, nor do they harm the original roof form or the character and appearance of the host building. The development complies with:
- Policies D1 and A1 of the Local Plan;
 - Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan;
 - Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan;
 - Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 and CPG6; and
 - The NPPF 2012.
- 5.40. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the scheme accords with the development plan and, as comprehensively set out in this Section, the appeal should be allowed.
- 5.41. As set out in paragraph 187 of the NPPF, the local planning authority should look for solutions rather than problems, and as decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

6. Conclusions

6.1. The conclusions in respect of this appeal are:

- The differences between the permitted development scheme (approved by the LDC 2015/7260/P) and the appeal scheme (2017/6848/P) are minor and barely noticeable;
- The extra volume has come about due to building practicalities. The appellant has not benefitted from any extra space arising from the appeal scheme;
- The host property has already been extended at ground floor and there was also previously a large dormer on the rear roof slope;
- The contemporary design is high quality and matches the existing ground floor extension and complements the original house. The muted colour palette and set-back from the building edge ensure the scheme does not result in an overwhelming or incongruous addition to the host building;
- The roof extensions can still be accommodated without harming the original roof form and character and appearance of the host building;
- The host property is not identified as a heritage asset or in a conservation area;
- The roof extensions along Ingham Road and the surrounding area are very mixed in terms of siting, scale, bulk and design, as the area has evolved naturally over the years;
- The roofscape to the rear of properties on the north side of Ingham Road is very irregular and there is still scope to successfully integrate new extensions at roof level (such as the appeal scheme) into this eclectic roofscape; and
- There is no adverse impact on neighbour amenity (as accepted by the council) and no neighbours objected to the application.

6.2. The rear dormer roof extension and 'pod' roof extension integrate into the roofscape. The siting, scale, bulk and design do not harm the character and appearance of the host building.

6.3. As stated earlier, a planning officer did not carry out a site visit to the appeal property when determining the application. It is not known how the officer could make a valid planning assessment without visiting the property.

- 6.4. The scheme complies with the policies cited on the decision notice (namely policy D1 of the Local Plan and policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan), as well as other development plan policies and guidance.
- 6.5. For all the reasons provided above, the Inspector is requested to **allow** this appeal.