

Date: 22/11/2022
Your Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3300405
Our Refs: 2021/4667/P

Contact: Tony Young
Direct line: 020 7974 2687
Email: tony.young@camden.gov.uk

Planning Solutions Team
Planning and Regeneration
Culture & Environment
Directorate
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

Tel: 020 7974 4444
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Heather Langridge
The Planning Inspectorate
3D, Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Heather Langridge,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr Rojer White
Site Address: 29 Buckland Crescent, 2nd floor flat, London, NW3 5DJ

I write in connection with the above appeal against a refusal of planning permission (Ref: 2021/4667/P) for the ***Erection of lean-to conservatory extension to enclose part of existing side/rear roof terrace at 2nd floor level, including relocation of external door opening to access the remaining part of the terrace.***

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The host building comprises a 3-storey stucco rendered, Italianate villa, typical of the immediate vicinity and is located on the south-east side of Buckland Crescent. The semi-detached property has previously been converted into residential flats and the current application proposal relates to a 2nd floor flat (Flat 3).
- 1.2 The property is not listed and is located within the Belsize Conservation Area. The building and wider terrace are identified as a group of buildings which make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area (Belsize Conservation Area Statement, adopted November 2002). The property is covered by an Article 4 Direction which removes certain permitted development rights from the appeal property for basement excavation and other development within the conservation area.
- 1.3 Planning permission was refused on 8th February 2022 (a copy of the decision notice was sent with the questionnaire) for the erection of a lean-to conservatory

extension to enclose part of an existing side/rear roof terrace at 2nd floor level, including the relocation of external door opening to access the remaining part of the terrace. The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. *The proposed conservatory extension, by virtue of its detailed design, siting, scale, form, bulk and materials, would result in an incongruous and dominant addition at 2nd floor roof level, particularly when illuminated by internal lights after dark. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host building identified as a positive contributor, the wider terrace and Belsize Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*
2. *The proposed conservatory extension, by virtue of its design, scale, location and materials, particularly when illuminated by internal lights after dark, would result in harm to neighbour amenity in respect of outlook and light pollution to the occupier/s of the residential unit at the upper floor of the adjacent property at no. 27 Buckland Crescent, contrary to Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*

1.4 The Council's case is set out in detail in the Officer's Delegated Report and it will be relied on as the principal Statement of Case. The report details the application site and surroundings, the site history and an assessment of the proposal. A copy of the report was sent with the questionnaire.

1.5 In addition to the information sent with the questionnaire, I would be pleased if the Inspector could also take into account the following information and comments before deciding the appeal.

2.0 Status of Policies and Guidance

2.1 In determining the above mentioned application, the London Borough of Camden has had regard to the relevant legislation, government guidance, statutory development plans and the particular circumstances of the case. The full text of the relevant policies was sent with the questionnaire documents.

2.2 The London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) was formally adopted on the 3 July 2017 as the basis for planning decisions and future development in the borough. The relevant Local Plan policies as they relate to the reason for refusal are:

- A1 Managing the impact of development
- D1 Design
- D2 Heritage

2.3 The Council also refers to the following supporting guidance document, Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) within the body of the Officer's Delegated Report:

- CPG Home Improvements (January 2021) – chapter's 'Key principles' (pages 16-32), 'Materials' (pages 36-37) and 'Extensions' (pages 40-54)
- CPG Design (January 2021) - chapters 2 (Design excellence) and 3 (Heritage)
- CPG Amenity (January 2021) - chapters 2 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook), 3 (Daylight and sunlight) and 4 (Artificial light)

Other guidance:

- Belsize Conservation Area Statement (adopted November 2002)

2.4 The Council also refers to the following legislation, policies and guidance within the body of the Officer's Delegated Report:

- Town and Country Planning Acts 1990 (as amended)
- National Planning Policy Framework (2021)
- London Plan (2021)

3.0 Comments on the appellant's Grounds of Appeal

3.1 The Officer's Delegated Report for the refused scheme is considered to comprehensively cover the Council's reasons for refusing the application. Notwithstanding this, the following response to the main content of the appellant's statement of case is provided below.

The appellant's grounds of appeal are summarised below and addressed under the following headings identified by the appellant as being the areas of disagreement with the Council (pages 10 and 11 of the supporting document, 'Appellant Statement of Common Ground' from Norton Taylor Nunn Ltd. dated August 2022):

1. Positive engagement
2. Description used by the LPA
3. Dominant addition
4. Harm to the character and appearance of the host building
5. Harm to neighbour's outlook and light pollution

4.0 Positive engagement

4.1 The appellant states that there was no site visit arranged to assess the proposal in the context of the surrounding environment, and that as a consequence, the application has not been properly assessed and that this is unreasonable behaviour.

5.0 Response to paragraph 4.0 above

- 5.1 Contrary to the appellant's view, the planning officer visited the site in January this year. This followed the receipt of additional information from the appellant at the time.
- 5.2 The visit was carried out from the front of the host property at street level. This allowed an appreciation of the impact of the proposal by the planning officer at both the side and front of the host property, as well as, within the wider appeal site context, also allowing consideration of a particular example of an existing high level conservatory at a neighbouring property (no. 37 Buckland Crescent) which was highlighted to the Council by the appellant.
- 5.3 The visit was unarranged and did not access the appeal site. This is not unusual practice for planning officers since the outbreak of the recent COVID-19 pandemic where face-to-face contact with applicants and owners has been kept to a minimum, especially given the additional sources of background and photographic information which are available to the Council when assessing application proposals within Camden. As such, the planning officer also had access to the Council's photographic library, planning application and appeal site history, spatial and GIS databases, and web-based mapping platforms, such as, Google Maps and Bing Maps.
- 5.4 It is also important to note that during the course of the application, the appellant provided additional information which included photographs taken from various positions within the appeal site at both the front and rear, as well as, ones showing views of various neighbouring properties and aerial views of the wider area. This helped to provide useful supplementary contextual information which was also taken into account during the assessment of the proposal in combination with the planning officer's own site visit and other site-based sources of information available to the planning officer as stated above.
- 5.5 Overall, therefore, the Council strongly disagrees with the appellant and is satisfied that the proposal which is the subject of this appeal has been properly and fully assessed based on a good level of understanding and knowledge of the site's characteristics and context that could reasonably be expected. The application has been assessed in light of this context and based on the individual merit of the proposal, having regard for all relevant policies and guidance, planning and appeal history.
- 5.6 Consequently, having initially informed the appellant on 23/12/2021 that the planning application would be recommended for refusal with an explanation for the reasons why this was the case, and following consideration of the subsequent response and additional information provided by the appellant on 09/01/2022 (including a site visit carried out by the planning officer), the appellant was informed on 17/01/2022 that the Council could not support the proposal on design and

amenity grounds. The appellant was also notified that any amendments were unlikely to overcome the strong concern raised by the Council in regard to the proposal and it was on that basis that the appellant was advised to withdraw the application in order to avoid a likely refusal.

- 5.7 Therefore, notwithstanding that the proposal could not be supported, the Council made every effort to correspond and engage as positively as possible with the appellant in accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF which requires the Council to work in a positive and proactive way with applicants.

6.0 Description used by the LPA

- 6.1 The appellant points out that that the proposed description refers to the side/rear extension and that the extension that accommodates the existing roof terrace is a side extension.

7.0 Response to paragraph 6.0 above

- 7.1 It's not entirely clear as to the relevance of the appellant's point in regard to the assessment of the application or what bearing it is considered to have on the subsequent decision that was reached.
- 7.2 Nonetheless, in order to clarify, and contrary to the appellant's statement, the proposed description does not refer to the extension as either *side* or *rear*. The proposal actually refers to the existing roof terrace as being a '*side/rear roof terrace at 2nd floor level.*'
- 7.3 Given that the proposed lean-to conservatory extension would enclose an area of flat roof (used as a terrace) which is located towards the rear corner of an existing side extension, the Council does not consider it to be either unreasonable or misleading to refer to the existing terrace space as being both at the side and rear by virtue of its corner position.
- 7.4 In fact, the appellant in Paragraph 4.8 of the supporting appeal statement states that '*As can be seen from the Floor Plan above, the existing side extension is positioned at the rear half of the building.*' And further in Paragraph 4.16 that the proposed lean-to conservatory would '*enclose a rear part of the existing terrace on the flat roof of the side extension.*' These statements by the appellant appear to express the situation in similar terms as the description used by the Council.
- 7.5 Nevertheless, notwithstanding how the existing terrace or extension might be described in terms of its location, or indeed the proposed lean-to conservatory itself, the proposal has been assessed by the Council as required, based on the existing and proposed drawings submitted by the appellant, and in light of the existing site context and any other information relevant to the assessment of the planning application as set-out in the Officer's Delegated Report.

8.0 Dominant addition

- 8.1 The appellant emphasises that the application is for the development of a glass conservatory that would allow maximum visibility through it. The position of the proposed development is stated as being partially screened by the existing side ledge of the host building with its visibility from the street being significantly limited due to the distance, proximity of the neighbouring building and vegetation.
- 8.2 The appellant also asserts that Paragraph 3.6 of the Officer's Delegated Report falsely states that '*The proposed single-pitched structure would increase the height of this part of the building by a further storey and would result in an extension higher than one full storey below the roof eaves.*' The plans submitted with the application are stated as showing that the eaves and pitch of the conservatory roof would appear lower than the host building's eaves level.
- 8.3 The appellant asserts more generally that the proposed lean-to conservatory will enhance the appearance of the existing flat roofed extension and positively complement the hip roof of the host building. Further, that the conservatory will have limited visibility due to its location and structural features of the host building and minimal impact on the host building and the area as it is carefully designed to retain the subordinate nature of this extension.

9.0 Response to paragraph 8.0 above

- 9.1 The Council strongly disagrees with the appellant in regard to the impact of the proposed conservatory. The fact that the conservatory allows maximum visibility through the structure by virtue of being extensively glazed does not overcome the harmful impact of the proposal when viewed from both the rear and front, particularly given the upper floor level position on a prominent corner location at the rear and side of the property.
- 9.2 In terms of materials, Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) states that '*Alterations and extensions should be carried out in materials that match the original or neighbouring buildings.*' CPG Home Improvements states that '*The texture, colour, pattern and finish of materials (detailing) should relate well to the existing character and appearance of both the existing home and the wider area, particularly in conservation areas.*'
- 9.3 The proposed conservatory walls and roof would be made of clear glass which would be double-glazed and set within grey coloured, polyester powder coated, aluminium frames. Glass would therefore be the predominant building material. It is noted as having a highly reflective quality and allows for possible glare, light spill and light pollution which has the potential to be dominant in appearance. The use of glass material to the extent and form proposed is not apparent at upper floor level

on neighbouring buildings at the rear, except for an isolated and historic example at no. 37 (see paragraphs 9.9 to 9.11 below).

- 9.4 Therefore, contrary to the appellant's view, the use of glazing at upper floor level would be a highly noticeable element of the proposed conservatory structure given its extensive use in both facades and the side sloping roof. While the use of glass (within aluminium frames) might in some cases be suitable at lower floor levels, it would stand out as an incongruous material in this upper floor context, appearing out of keeping and jarring with the existing palette of materials on the upper floors of the wider rear terrace as a whole. As such, it would not respect or relate well to the existing character and appearance of the appeal and neighbouring buildings at the rear by virtue of the additional height, bulk, altered form and glass material.
- 9.5 The appellant argues that the proposed rectangular panels of glazing would ensure that they correspond visually with existing rectangular windows on the rear elevations of buildings in the vicinity. Contrary to this view, the Council considers that the proposed glazing is not comparable in appearance to existing windows other than the fact that glass material is used. The substantial amount of glass material proposed to be used would serve to heighten the prominence and impact of a upper floor glass structure far more significantly than the introduction of a new window in terms of its design, size, form, bulk and location.
- 9.6 This would be the case both during the day, by introducing the potential for generating sun reflection and glare, but also at night, through the potential for excessive light pollution and spillage associated with a likely increased frequency of use of the roof area, given that it's proposed enclosure would allow it to be used more intensively throughout the whole year, regardless of weather, temperature or the degree of natural light available.
- 9.7 It is noted that the appellant mainly references the impact of the proposal on views from the front of the building and asserts that it would not detract from the historical architecture features of the front facades of the host building.
- 9.8 While the Council recognises, and has given full consideration to, the historic importance of the front of the appeal site and wider group of neighbouring buildings as positive contributors within the Belsize Conservation Area (see Paragraphs 3.11 to 3.13 of the Officer's Delegated Report), the Council has also given due consideration throughout to the impact of the proposal at the rear. As such, the proposed use and appearance of glass material is recognised as also having a detrimental impact on the wider rear terrace, by its adverse effect on the character and appearance of the locality, especially given the proposed upper floor, corner position. This would make it particularly noticeable from private views from neighbouring properties and gardens at the rear, but also to a significant, if lesser degree, when viewed from the front through the available narrow side street view.

- 9.9 The appellant has referenced an existing conservatory (no. 37 Buckland Crescent) as being similar to the current proposals. The Council has taken this into consideration. The development, a side/rear conservatory at a similar floor level and position, is noted as having received planning permission (ref. 8600176) in 1986. However, this permission significantly predates current policies and guidance, as well as, the adoption of the Belsize Conservation Area Statement (adopted in November 2002), and would unlikely receive planning permission under current policies. As such, it is considered to be an isolated, historic example which does not set any precedent for the appeal site.
- 9.10 Furthermore, it is noted that what has been implemented at no. 37 is not what was approved at the time. The existing conservatory appears to be longstanding and has likely acquired established rights over time, and as such, has become immune from enforcement action, such that, planning permission is not required. The approved conservatory extension is noted as being much more modest in size than the existing conservatory in situ, occupying a smaller portion of the 2nd floor roof area and being well set-back from the roof edges at both the side and rear.
- 9.11 The appellant states in Paragraph 4.26 of the supporting appeal statement that the existing glass conservatory at no. 37 Buckland Crescent is noticeably larger than the subject of the present appeal. That is clearly not the case. The proposed conservatory extension at the appeal site would occupy a substantially larger footprint than not only the approved extension, but also the existing extension, at no. 37. This can clearly be seen by a comparison of the proposed drawings at the appeal site and the approved drawings (ref. 8600176), as well as, by comparison with the existing extension in situ at no. 37. As such, neither is considered to represent any kind of comparable example or precedent in design terms for the proposal which is the subject of this appeal, especially given the historic nature of both and in the absence of formal planning consideration of the existing conservatory in situ.
- 9.12 The appellant also referenced existing local examples of extensions and use of glazing considered by the appellant to be relevant. The Council has also taken these into consideration. Most of the examples are at rear lower floor levels (for instance, the examples referenced by the appellant at nos. 29, 31 and 35) which have different impacts and require different consideration to those on upper floors which tend to be more visible and can have a greater impact on the form and character of the main building, depending on their particular site context. Other examples of development on upper floors referred to by the appellant appear to involve alterations to more contemporary properties or buildings set within a different site context, and as such, are not considered to be sufficiently similar or comparable to set any precedent for the current proposal.
- 9.13 In regard to views from the front in particular, the proposed structure would be visible from the front of the property, through a narrow gap between the host

property and the neighbouring building at no. 27. Though visibility from the street would be limited to some degree when a front garden tree is in full leaf, the extension would nevertheless be visible from the public realm given its size, location and prominence, as well as, at night when it would appear illuminated (see Image 1 below).



Image 1 – showing view from street identified in Belsize CA Statement

- 9.14 The Belsize Conservation Area Statement recognises the importance of the narrow street views between buildings in Buckland Crescent and states that, '*The closely spaced villas maintain a continuous building line and their repeated forms with narrow gaps between give a uniform rhythm to the streets and provide important, glimpsed views.*' The proposal would adversely impact on one of these narrow gaps and important glimpsed views referred to in the Belsize Conservation Area Statement, not only by the degree to which it would further erode into the valued openness between buildings, but also through the adverse impact it would have on the historic and architectural integrity of the host and neighbouring buildings.
- 9.15 It is the historic and architectural design and form of these buildings as a group, in conjunction with the important gaps and spaces between the buildings, which largely account for the significance and positive contribution which the buildings make to special character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement states that Buckland Crescent '*is characterised by the repeated forms of the stucco villas, whose design gives a strong identity and unity of appearance to the area.*' The proposal would disrupt the strong and consistent building character by noticeably altering the design and form of the host building at the side at upper floor level, so appearing as an incongruous

and dominant addition that would materially harm the otherwise well-preserved and uniform appearance of the host building and wider group of villas.

- 9.16 The appellant's assertion in Paragraph 4.13 of the supporting appeal statement that the Council has made a false statement in regard to the height of the extension relative to the eaves is strongly disputed by the Council. Rather, the Council contends that the appellant has not fully understood the relevant paragraph of the Officer's Delegated Report and has not given due consideration to the relevant guidance in regard to the recommended height of proposed side extensions.
- 9.17 The relevant paragraph challenged by the appellant is Paragraph 3.6 of the Officer's Delegated Report which states that *'The proposed single-pitched structure would increase the height of this part of the building by a further storey and would result in an extension higher than one full storey below the roof eaves.'*
- 9.18 Firstly, comparison of existing and proposed rear elevations (see Images 1 and 2 below) clearly show that the existing side elevation is proposed to be increased in height by a further storey as stated in Paragraph 3.6. Secondly, this increase in height would mean that the extension is no longer one full storey below the roof eaves, but rather, it would be positioned immediately below eaves height as a result of the proposal. This is also clear from the submitted drawings and as stated in Paragraph 3.6 above.



Images 2 and 3 – existing and proposed rear elevation drawings

- 9.19 Additionally, CPG Home Improvements guidance advises in Section 2.1.2 (Side and front extensions) that side extensions should be confined in most circumstances to a single storey. However, the existing side return, which is already 3-storeys in height above lower ground floor level, does not accord with this guidance, and in the case of the appeal proposal, this appearance would be worsened contrary to the above guidance, by virtue of being extended a further storey in height.

- 9.20 Overall, therefore, the proposed conservatory extension at 2nd floor roof level, by virtue of its detailed design, siting, scale, form, bulk, materials and internal illumination, would result in an incongruous and dominant addition which would neither respect the original design and proportions of the host building, nor the historic and architectural integrity of the wider terrace as a whole, and fails to be read as a subordinate extension.
- 9.21 As such, the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the host building identified as a positive contributor, the wider terrace and the Belsize Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017. The Planning Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal on that basis.
- 9.22 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

10.0 Harm to character and appearance of host building

- 10.1 The appellant included 2 photographs in Paragraph 4.27 of the supporting appeal statement. In the first photograph, the appellant points out that Buckland Crescent has street lighting and the street is not dark during night hours.
- 10.2 The second photograph shows an existing conservatory at no. 37 Buckland Crescent. The photograph is considered by the appellant to demonstrate that the light from the conservatory is negligible in the context of existing street lighting. Further, while accepting that it is an historic development, the appellant considers that the example at no. 37 cannot be completely ignored in this case.
- 10.3 Finally, the appellant provided 2 further photographs in Paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 showing 2 mature deciduous trees to the left and right of the appeal site which the appellant states prevent any possibility that the side extension could be seen in any long views and screen the appeal site from the street view fully when in leaf.

11.0 Response to paragraph 10.0 above

- 11.1 It is firstly important to emphasise to the Planning Inspector at this point that the Council has not ignored the example given at no. 37 Buckland Crescent. Paragraph 3.18 of the Officer's Delegated Report explicitly refers to this example and confirms that it has been taken into consideration during the assessment.
- 11.2 Paragraph 3.18 also confirms that this example does not set any precedent for similar alterations at the appeal site and is an isolated, historic example. This is because the planning permission (ref. 8600176) granted in 1986 significantly predates current policies and guidance, as well as, the adoption of the Belsize

Conservation Area Statement (adopted in November 2002). The existing high-level conservatory at no. 37 would, therefore, unlikely receive planning permission were it to be considered under current policies and guidance. Again, though the example is not considered to set a precedent for similar alterations, it emphasised that it has not been ignored by the Council in the assessment of the appeal proposals.

- 11.3 Furthermore, it is noted in Paragraphs 9.9 to 9.11 above that what has been implemented at no. 37 is not what was approved at the time. As such, neither the approved or existing conservatory at no. 37 is considered to represent any kind of comparable example or precedent in design terms for the appeal proposal, especially given the historic nature of both and in the absence of formal planning consideration of the existing conservatory in situ.
- 11.4 Additionally in this regard, following an examination of the photograph provided by the appellant of the existing conservatory at night, it is the Council's view that, rather than having a negligible impact in the streetscene as the appellant asserts, the photograph highlights the unsuitability and adverse impact of the conservatory extension at no. 37. The excessively illuminated nature of the existing structure, even allowing for its recessed position towards the rear of the property and the degree of street lighting, strongly suggests that the current proposals being considered here in this appeal would also have a similarly detrimental impact.
- 11.5 This impact would be evident at the front of the appeal property given the narrow gap and important glimpsed view between it and the neighbouring building at no. 27 as referred to in the Belsize Conservation Area Statement (see Image 1 above). However, the impact of a proposed high-level conservatory at night would be most evident in private views from neighbouring properties and gardens at the rear. It is notable in this regard that the appellant has only included photographs in regard to illumination at the front of the property.
- 11.6 The Council considers that the possible impact of illumination and lighting should also be taken into account at the rear of the property. In this regard, and as stated in Paragraph 3.17 of the Officer's Delegated Report, the glass material would serve to heighten the prominence of the proposed structure, both during the day and night. However, at night, there is the potential for excessive light pollution and spillage, particularly at the rear of the property, associated with a likely increased frequency of use of the roof area and the substantial amount of glazing introduced at upper floor level. As such, the proposed use and appearance of glass material would have a detrimental impact on the local environment by changing the character of the locality, both at the rear and side of the property, especially given the upper floor level position on a prominent corner location of the property.
- 11.7 In regard to any natural screening provided at the front of the property by virtue of the presence of street trees, though visibility from the street would be limited to some degree when a front garden tree to the left of the appeal site is in full leaf, the

proposed extension would nevertheless be visible from the public realm, given its size, location and prominence. However, at all other times, the existing side/rear terrace would be clearly visible from the street as shown by Image 1 above.

12.0 Harm to neighbour's outlook and light pollution

12.1 The appellant asserts that a window at a neighbouring property (no. 27 Buckland Crescent) identified in the Officer's Delegated Report as being affected by the proposal has been bricked up for several years.

13.0 Response to paragraph 12.0 above

13.1 The information provided by the appellant has been reviewed and it is acknowledged by the Council that an oversight has been made in this regard as the window space is bricked up and no longer in use.

13.2 As such, the following reason for refusal (no. 2) is no longer relevant and it is respectfully requested that the Planning Inspector omits this reason for refusal from consideration:

The proposed conservatory extension, by virtue of its design, scale, location and materials, particularly when illuminated by internal lights after dark, would result in harm to neighbour amenity in respect of outlook and light pollution to the occupier/s of the residential unit at the upper floor of the adjacent property at no. 27 Buckland Crescent, contrary to Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

13.3 For clarity, the Council maintains that the appeal proposal remains unacceptable on design grounds as stated in the reason for refusal (no. 1) and for the reasons as set-out in this statement. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal on that basis.

14.0 Conclusion

14.1 Based on the information set out above, and having taken account all of the additional evidence and arguments made, it is considered that the proposal remains unacceptable in that it would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

14.2 The information submitted by the appellant in support of the appeal does address the amenity concern previously raised by the Council in the reason for refusal (no. 2); however, it does not overcome the Council's concerns in design terms. The proposed conservatory extension, therefore, by virtue of its detailed design, siting, scale, form, bulk and materials, would result in an incongruous and dominant addition at 2nd floor roof level, particularly when illuminated by internal lights after

dark. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host building identified as a positive contributor, the wider terrace and Belsize Conservation Area.

- 14.3 For this reason, and on the basis of the information available and having regard to the entirety of the Council's submissions, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.

Yours sincerely,

Tony Young

Planning Technician - Planning Solutions Team
Supporting Communities Directorate
London Borough of Camden