

Household planning appeal

Michelle Hammond
Flat D
41 Belsize Square
London
NW3 4HN
Application ref: 2018/4915/P

X October 2019

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter is to appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990. The London Borough of Camden (the "Council") refused my application for planning permission for the following reason:

- The proposed development, by reason of its design and prominent location, would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the Belsize Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Local Plan 2017

The Council also outlined in its decision that it has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

My planning application (appendix 1) and its supporting materials outline my desire to replace the existing, poorly conditioned, sash window with a double door and add wrought iron balustrading to the existing balcony.

The Council suggests that the works are contrary to the Belsize Conservation Area, however, there are multiple examples (including in the attached to this application, appendix 2) of first floor double doors and wrought iron balustrades within the Conservation Area.

The Council's own [statement](#) on the area makes clear that new developments that do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area are generally due to one of the following:

- Inappropriate materials
- Inappropriate scale/bulk/height/massing
- Inappropriate relationship to street and neighbouring properties
- Impact on privacy of neighbouring properties
- Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

My planned works do not impact any of these factors. The materials and colours used will be identical to neighbouring properties, the scale will remain unchanged (appendix 3 & 4), there are

numerous examples of similar completed works (appendix 2), there will be no impact on privacy to neighbouring properties and there are no alternations or extensions being made to the existing building.

It is clear that in coming to its decision, the Council did not seek to work with myself in a positive or proactive manor. The Councils took 40 weeks to reach its decision. Only after repeat requests did it respond to my application, and in doing so the Council was dismissive and acted without candour.

In addition, the Council suggests that it wants to preserve the building's existing façade but has made no clear effort to maintain it. The existing sash window is in poor condition, loose and with rotting wood, and weathered paint is consistently being stripped off across the front of the building.

I look forward to hearing from the Inspectorate at its earliest convenience.

Yours Sincerely,

Michelle Hammond