

---

**From:** Inderjit Shokar <ishokar@resolutionplanning.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 November 2021 13:54  
**To:** North2  
**Cc:** Brooks, David; Chris Griffiths  
**Subject:** Re: Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/Y/21/3274711: 60 Delancey Street, NW1 7RY  
**Attachments:** 211 Statement and 3rd Party Reps - To App or LPA - Inderjit Shokar - 01 Nov 2021[1].pdf

Dear Dot

Thank you for the attached letter.

Our 'Final Comments' are as follows:

1. Disagree with LPA view that spotlights are harmful to the building's heritage. It actually extends the building lifespan and longevity in our view, which outweighs any perceived limited harm.
2. We think nearby listed houses with spotlights must be taken into consideration, despite LPA's position. The small details add up and contribute to the character and appearance of the wider street-scene when viewed at ground level. In this respect, our property blends in well and is not out of character with local vernacular.
3. We fail to see how paragraph 134 of the NPPF is relevant to the appeal (or D2 of the Camden Local Plan), given that the contested works of alteration to the listed building cannot be classed as 'development' requiring planning permission, and to which Section 12 of the NPPF likely relates. It is difficult to see how this was intended to cover internal light fittings to listed buildings.
4. The Council's reference to paras 213-216 of the NPPF is presumably the old NPPF reference.
5. Re Paragraph 4.4, with regard to the effect of this kind of change on the conservation area as a whole, we challenge the LPA's logic here. The appeal statement is certainly not suggesting that any development in the conservation area would be acceptable. What is submitted is that the particular change brought about by this kind of internal lighting is so minor in relation to the conservation area as a whole that it cannot possibly be described as harmful, particularly on account of the prevalence of interior spotlighting to many of the houses on Delancey Street and the surrounding terraces. The question of fact and degree with regard to the impact is what matters and clearly the spotlighting has a minimal impact on the CA. The Conservation Area was addressed in view of the reasoning provided in the delegated report.
6. Re Paragraph 4.8 – *"the appellant argues that the number of spotlights is proportionate to the room size. This is possibly true, if you accept that recessed spotlights are acceptable in principal spaces of listed buildings, which they are not."* It is clearly not as simple or dogmatic as saying that recessed spotlights are not acceptable in principal spaces of listed buildings. The truth of the matter is, it depends on the state of preservation and what effect such an intervention would have on the listed building's significance. In the present case, there are numerous instances of similar lighting within the same listed building (other terraced houses) which has not noticeably diminished the significance of this designated heritage asset.

***We would be grateful if you could confirm safe receipt of this email please?***

Many thanks  
Indy