

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2013

**by Bridget M Campbell BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 20 December 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/13/2208189**

**The Coach House, 18A Upper Park Road, London NW3 2UP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mrs C Barazzone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2013/3817/P was refused by notice dated 9 August 2013.
  - The development proposed is a single storey glass room to the rear of the existing dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey glass room to the rear of the existing dwelling at The Coach House, 18A Upper Park Road, London NW3 2UP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2013/3817/P, dated 13 June 2013, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: O1533201, 13.34.1, 13.34.2 and 13.35.3.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed conservatory on the character and appearance of the Parkhill Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. Parkhill Conservation Area is a small and compact area which is predominantly residential in nature. Quiet streets branch from the busy Haverstock Hill and are characterised by large Italianate houses dating from about 1850, late Victorian red brick gabled houses and interspersed with some more recent infill. There is a variety of style and quality.
4. The appeal site is situated within a line of imposing Italianate semi detached villas lining the south-eastern side of Upper Park Road. The dwelling on the appeal site is very modest in comparison to its neighbours. It has only two stories with the first floor set into a mansard-style roof and including a decorative gable to the front with detailing to reflect that of its neighbours. For such a modest property, however, the dwelling has a generous garden but,

- unusually, that accommodates a further detached two storey brick built residential building with a conservatory to which access is gained via a covered walkway.
5. The proposed conservatory would be attached to the rear of the dwelling. Its proportions are such that it would clearly appear as a subservient and minor addition to the main dwelling since it would project only by some 3 metres, would extend across less than half of the width of the rear of the house and would have a shallow pitch that would not rise above the existing box gutter at the base of the mansard roof. With a solid wall only along that side adjacent to the existing boundary wall, the structure would otherwise be glazed within slim line aluminium framing. The delicate and lightweight appearance of the structure together with its restrained proportions would ensure that its visual impact would be minimal. It would be an apposite addition to the house.
  6. The Council says that a combination of several structures in the rear garden does not follow the historic pattern of development of the conservation area. That is no doubt so, but on the appeal site that is an existing situation rather than one which would result from the addition of this small conservatory. It is the two storey brick built building and the covered walkway leading to it which impose and do not follow the convention of frontage development with a length of open rear garden beyond. However, even with that somewhat unusual on-site layout, a sufficient amount of open garden remains to provide a suitable landscaped setting for the residential buildings.
  7. The addition of the small, lightweight and finely framed conservatory on an area already providing a hard surfaced patio will have no appreciable effect on the existing relationship between the residential buildings or on the setting afforded by the remaining open areas of the garden. The overall reduction in garden space would be negligible. The rear gardens of the residential properties are important components of the conservation area which positively contribute to both its character and appearance. In this instance, however, and given the particular and unusual characteristics of the appeal site, I find that the addition of the modest conservatory proposed would not result in any noticeable loss of existing openness nor would it give the buildings a cramped appearance.
  8. On the main issue I conclude that the proposed conservatory would preserve the character and appearance of the Parkhill Conservation Area. It does not conflict with the policies of the Development Plan which seek a high standard of design, preservation of appropriate garden spaces and the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas (in particular Core Strategy policy CS14 and Development Policies policies DP24 and DP25).
  9. Although the Council has suggested that a condition be imposed on any permission granted that materials should match existing, the detail of the materials is shown on the submitted drawings and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with those drawings is sufficient.
  10. I have taken all other matters raised in the written submissions into account and for the reasons given conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*Bridget M Campbell*

Inspector