

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/16/3151526

Unit 5, 120A Clarence Road, Clapton, London E5 8JA

- 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 Mr Steve Georgiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2016/0122, dated 8 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof extension to existing residential unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. For clarity I have amended the original description of the development set out in the planning application form to matters directly related to the development in line with the revised description agreed by the appellant and Council. The appeal is determined on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace three-storey building which fronts directly onto Clarence Road that has been converted into separate residential flats and studios. The neighbouring properties comprise of a dense mix of generally three-storey terraced properties set in narrow plots with some commercial uses at ground floor level and residential uses at the upper levels.
 5. The proposal would involve the construction of a roof extension to create additional accommodation for an existing residential unit. The proposal would be of a flat topped design with a sloping front elevation that would sit slightly under the front parapet wall and a vertical rear elevation built off the rear building line of the property incorporating a butterfly parapet wall. The overall height of the extension would be about 1m above the parapet wall and would be predominantly constructed from slate or similar materials.
 6. The design and appearance of the proposed roof extension however would be very much at odds with the older more traditional character and appearance of
-

many of the properties in the area and the advice contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and Alterations 2009 (SPD). This requires a more traditional roof form for such development with the front and rear elevations of the extension to be stepped from the relevant parapets and constructed with sloping roof faces.

7. The proposed extension would result in a material alteration to the property's butterfly roof, which when viewed from the rear of the building, currently makes a positive contribution to the roofscape of the terrace of properties and the character and appearance of the area. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the extension's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Clarence Road and Downs Road above the front parapet wall and from Sladen Place at the rear. As such I consider that the proposed extension, by virtue of its siting and design, would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition to the property and the street scene.
8. The extension would be visible at the front from the New Testament Church of God which is a locally listed building at the end of Downs Road. However, given the modest scale of the extension and the separation distance between the property and the church, the proposal would have no material impact on the setting of the locally listed building. The setting would therefore be preserved.
9. I have noted those planning permissions and the other developments drawn to my attention by the appellant. The planning approval for the roof extension at 2 Dunlace Road has different locational characteristics to the appeal scheme. The mansard roofs at 48 Clarence Road, 125 Clarence Road, 157 Clarence Road and 114 Farleigh Road arose in a different policy context some time ago. The other examples highlighted of mansard roofs and loft conversions in the area are on different streets to the appeal site and, as such, I afford them limited weight as comparative examples in this case.
10. I have considered the appellant's comments that the proposal would create a well-designed family dwelling that would be located close to services and make efficient use of an existing building for housing. However, a single dwelling would make only a limited contribution towards the supply of housing in the area and these factors would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy 24 of the Hackney Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010 and Policy DM1 of the Hackney Development Management Local Plan 2015. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area. The development does not accord with the Council's SPD which includes similar aims relating to good design for roof extensions as set out above, which respects and responds positively to original buildings and the street scene.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR