



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2018

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/17/3189868

26A The Coach House, Upper Park Road, London NW3 2UT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Amy Gunning against the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2017/3834/P is dated 5 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is mansard roof extension on the existing flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has provided a decision notice. Although jurisdiction has passed to the Inspectorate, having accepted the appeal against non-determination, this notice gives the Council's reason for the refusal had it been in a position to make the decision and informs the main issue in the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the mansard roof extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene, including whether this would preserve or enhance that of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No 26A is a two-storey with basement dwelling attached to the much taller and larger semi-detached villa at No 26. On its other side the appeal property is attached to a somewhat similar 'coach house' addition to the larger villa at No 24. The properties are within the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. The significance of this part is the Italianate design and regular spacing of the large, semi-detached Victorian villas which give the curved, tree-lined street-scene a picturesque quality. Many of the gaps between these large, semi-detached houses have been the subject of infill development providing various coach house additions built to a subservient scale.
5. The proposal is for a mansard addition on the existing roof to provide a new bedroom with en-suite bathroom. It would be set back 3m from the front façade where it is proposed to reinstate the front parapet. The mansard would be roofed with slates and have two conservation-style roof lights at the front,

- providing light to the bathroom, and a rectilinear fully-glazed projection to the bedroom, topping the more contemporary design of the existing rear elevation.
6. The host property has been built to a lower level than the adjoining coach house at No 24, which itself has a mansard roof which projects significantly higher than that proposed in this scheme. The appeal scheme has sought to address the Council's reasons for refusing an earlier proposal by reducing the forward projection and height of the mansard and removing front dormers and a rear terrace.
 7. However, this scheme breaches the requirements of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAA). This restricts infill extensions to two-storeys at no greater height than the cornice line of the front porch and resists the addition of mansard roofs. The proposal thereby conflicts with policies D1 and D2 of the recently adopted Camden Local Plan of 2017 (LP), concerning design and heritage respectively.
 8. I have a statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states in paragraph 132 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
 9. I consider that the intention of the newly-adopted LP policies, and the quite recent CAA guidance, is to resist the harm that further incremental additions to the various coach house additions would have on the main semi-detached villas and the open gaps between them. Although No 24A is a separate dwelling I consider the restrictions applied to the existing side additions remain applicable to this building.
 10. I have taken account of the evidence that mansard roof additions have been permitted nearby at various addresses in Parkhill Road, often with adjacent coach houses appearing paired as a result, and that this proposal would sit adjacent to the much taller roof additions to No 24. However, I am not aware of when these other examples were permitted and I do not consider they serve as compelling precedents for a scheme which would conflict with current development plan policy.
 11. The mansard would rise slightly above the height of the porch to No 26 and be set back so as to not be visually prominent in the street scene. The glazed rear part of the mansard would reflect the more contemporary appearance of the elevation facing the garden and not be visible from the public realm. Despite its relatively limited visual impact this form of mansard addition would nonetheless detract from the appearance of the host building and this part of the street scene and cause harm to the significance of the Conservation Area.
 12. Although the harm would be less than substantial, considerable importance and weight should be given to that found, with the presumption that preservation is desirable. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, paragraph 134 of the Framework requires that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

13. There would be no public benefits to weigh against the harm found to the significance of the Conservation Area. As the mansard roof would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area, and detract from that of the host building and the wider street scene, this proposal would conflict with the aims of LP policies D1 and D2.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal be dismissed and permission refused.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR