
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2016

by **C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 23rd September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/16/3153328

62-64 Stoke Newington High Street, Hackney, London N16 7PB

- 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 Ismail Properties Investment LTD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2015/4528, dated 16 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2016.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: "Two storey infill rear extension (at first and second floor), erection of mansard roof and internal alterations to accommodate 3 x Two Bedroom Flat and 2 x One Bedroom Flat."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, the Council's decision notice describes the development as "Erection of two-storey rear infill extension at first and second floor levels; erection of mansard roof extension; creation of two-bedroom flat with roof terrace at mansard level; internal alterations to existing flats", and I note that the appellant has used this description in the Appeal Statement. The revised description more precisely describes the proposed development, and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on a prominent corner at the end of an imposing 3 storey terrace, and is thus highly visible from Stoke Newington High Street. The host terrace has a strong horizontal parapet and the existing butterfly roof form set below the parapet is not visible from ground level. There are no apparent roof alterations to the terrace, which retains a significant degree of uniformity.
 5. The Hackney Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPDREA) notes that the continuity of the parapet line is an
-

important townscape feature of early/mid Victorian streets, and goes on to state that roof extensions are not normally acceptable in those terraces where an unbroken roofline remains.

6. The proposed mansard roof extension would be a substantial addition to the appeal property, rising to a considerable height above the parapet line and disrupting the established architectural form and rhythm of the terrace as a whole. Although the proposed development would be set back behind the parapet along both Stoke Newington High Street and Hollar Road, and so would not be visible from the street immediately in front of the appeal property, it would nevertheless be prominent in longer range views. Therefore, by reason of its siting and scale, the proposed mansard roof would result in the creation of a discordant and incongruous feature.
7. Other examples of mansard roof extensions in the area have been brought to my attention. However, I do not have full details of these schemes or the individual site circumstances of each case. I have reached my conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
8. The side return of the appeal property steps down in height along Hollar Road, with a mono-pitched roof 3 storey projection to the rear of No 62 set behind a parapet. Beyond this, along the southern boundary of the appeal site, there is another 3 storey projection to the rear of No 64.
9. The proposed rear extension would infill the space at first and second floor level between the existing rear projections. The proposed butterfly roof would echo the main roof of the appeal property, and the scale and form of the extension would reflect surrounding development and remain secondary to the main building. Although the proposed development would be visible from Hollar Road, views would be oblique and framed by the existing rear projections. As such, this element of the appeal proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area. However, the rear extension forms an integral part of the overall scheme and therefore it is not severable from the rest of the proposed development.
10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the design aims of Policy 7.4 of the London Plan, Policy 24 of the Hackney Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Hackney Development Management Local Plan and the SPDREA.

Conclusion

11. I note that the appellant has sought to address concerns raised by the Inspector in relation to an earlier appeal (Ref APP/U5360/A/14/2220894) through revisions to the scheme, and many of these issues have now been resolved. Although the detailed design of the proposed mansard has been amended, nonetheless, for the reasons identified above the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
12. I have had regard to the benefits of the proposed development in terms of the provision of an additional residential unit and improvements to the existing

flats within the appeal property. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified with regard to the main issue.

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

CL Humphrey

INSPECTOR