

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/17/3171809
24 Dumont Road, Hackney, London, N16 0NS

- 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 A Meucci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2016/4324, dated 23 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension to main and lower roofs.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of the development used in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, I note that the description on both the appeal form and the Council's decision notice is: "the erection of a full width rear roof extension; second floor roof extension above the two storey rear outrigger; raise the roof ridgeline by 300mm and exterior alterations." I consider that this represents a fuller and more accurate description of the development and therefore, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey terraced dwelling with a two storey rear outrigger. It is situated in a residential area and adjoins the Stoke Newington Conservation Area (CA). I note that the Council's officer states that the proposal would not affect the setting of the CA because the property is hidden from public view. I have no reason to disagree with that conclusion.
 5. The proposal would provide an additional bedroom, study and storage space at the property, in the form of a full-width dormer roof extension on the main roof and a flat-roofed extension above the existing outrigger at second floor level.
-

In addition, the ridgeline of the main roof would be raised by 300mm and 2 rooflights inserted in the front-facing roof slope.

6. My attention has been drawn to other extensions in the area, including a roof extension at number 20 Dumont Road (number 20). However, I am not persuaded that the extension at number 20 should create a precedent for other developments in the area. Consequently, I have determined this appeal on its individual merits.
7. Policy 24 of the Hackney Core Strategy 2015; Policy DM1 of the Development Management Local Plan 2015; and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 generally seek to ensure that all development is of a high quality design that contributes positively to the area. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD) provides additional guidance. This states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling and that roof extensions should be of high quality design and in scale and proportion with the original roof. In my opinion, the policies and guidance accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which also requires planning to secure high quality design and requires development to add to the overall quality of the area in which it is located (paragraphs 17 and 58).
8. Although the proposed development would not be visible from Dumont Road, in my opinion it would be overly large and visually incongruous in relation to the existing dwelling and its roof. The proposal would be an overly dominant addition which would be out of scale and proportion with the existing property because of its incompatible design, width and overall bulk. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would, therefore, conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, the Council's SPD and the Framework, as referred to above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR