
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2016

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/16/3148193

65 Craven Walk, London, N16 6BX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Jacobs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2015/4086, dated 11 November 2015, was refused on 7 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is a the erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within an established residential area comprising predominantly of Edwardian terraces. The dwelling on the appeal site is an end-terraced property, which occupies a corner location at the junction of Craven Walk and Leadale Road. Craven Walk slopes down from west to east and the dwelling occupies an elevated position relative to the pavement and road along Leadale Road, and to a lesser extent from Craven Walk.
 4. The dwelling has been previously extended with a single storey addition to the rear and large box dormers to the front and rear roof slopes. The existing single storey addition contrasts with the original dwelling, being of rendered elevations with a flat roof behind parapet walls at either side. Recently, a further permission has been granted for a part single, part two storey rear extension. The single storey element is the same as that now proposed, but the first floor element is smaller, extending across only about two-thirds of the width of the dwelling, with a flat roof.
 5. Given the existing permission as referred to above, the single storey element of the current proposed extensions would be acceptable, as it is identical in size and appearance. However, the first floor element is larger, extending across the whole width of the dwelling, and would incorporate a small hipped roof.
-

6. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2009) seeks high quality design and extensions that respect the character and size of the original property. It notes that the prominence of corner properties whose rear can be seen from adjoining streets is an additional consideration. Rear extensions should be subordinate and the form and materials should reflect the original building. The existing dwelling has already been much altered and extended, as have a number within the immediate locality. However, its original form is discernible, despite the large roof dormers, with certain original elements such as the gabled flank elevation and relatively modest original span identifiable.
7. I consider that the proposed first floor element of the extension, by reason of its siting across the whole width of the dwelling, and its rather awkward, albeit small, hipped roof over, would, when read together with the existing roof additions, result in an unsympathetic extension that would visually overwhelm and dominate the existing dwelling. In my view, the proposal would not achieve the subordination in terms of overall height and width that would be provided by the approved first floor addition. In my view it would not be a complementary addition.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. It would therefore conflict with policy 24 of the Hackney Core Strategy LDF (2010) and policy DM1 of the Development Management Local Plan (2015) which seek a high standard of design which reinforces and complements local distinctiveness, and optimises the distinctive character of existing buildings, I also find that the proposal would not satisfy the guidance contained in the Council's SPD which provides more detailed guidance to support the above policies as referred to above.
9. It would also conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015), which seek development that builds on the positive elements of the character of an area and make a positive contribution to the public realm and streetscape.
10. I have noted the personal circumstances set out by the appellant, whereby there is a need to accommodate their large family and to be near their community. However, I do not find these matters to be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR