

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 22nd June 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/17/3167063

346 Queensbridge Road, Hackney, London E8 3AR

- 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 Uri Eisenstein against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2016/1350, dated 18 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "Conversion to create one 3-bed flat and one 2-bed flat; reduction in floorspace of commercial unit used as estate agency (A2 use class) at ground floor level; erection of mansard roof extension to create additional level at third floor with two front and two rear dormer windows; erection of part single-storey, part two-storey, part three-storey rear extension up to second floor level; removal of single-storey outbuilding in rear garden; alterations to side elevation of existing building (windows and doors; establish internal and external refuse/recycling storage and cycle storage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the appeal form as this is consistent with the description given on the decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area; in particular, the Queensbridge Road Conservation Area and the Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three storey end of terrace building, located on a prominent corner at the junction with Forest Road. It lies within the Queensbridge Road Conservation Area and is adjacent to the boundary of the Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area.
 5. The Council defines the significance of the Queensbridge Road Conservation Area as mid-Victorian terraced houses and villas interspersed with listed buildings. The Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area displays similar characteristics. The appeal building forms part of an attractive terrace, dating from around 1840, which has a unified architectural style with consistent
-

design features. In particular, the building retains its original 'butterfly roof', which adds considerable character to the terrace and contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area.

6. The development would include a mansard roof extension to create an additional storey. Whilst the resulting building would be taller than the adjoining property, it would reflect the height of other buildings in the terrace. However, the roof extension combined with the proposed rear extensions would have a significant visual impact. The relatively large rear extensions at first and second floor level would dominate the side and rear elevations of the original building, and the other properties in the terrace. The original butterfly roof design would be completely masked by the development, and the traditional rear elevation of this Victorian building would be adversely affected. The development would not reflect the characteristic architectural style of the building in terms of the massing and rhythm, roof lines and form, and the extensions would appear incongruous and out of character. Moreover, the extensions would be highly visible and the development would not be sensitive to the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area. I appreciate that other properties in the terrace have rear extensions and roof alterations, however, these are in less prominent locations and are smaller in scale.
7. I do not agree with the appellant's argument that the development would be read as an extension to the main building. The extensions would form an integral part of the building and would mask its original form. They would not appear as a clearly separate and distinct modern addition. Although the front elevation would be less effected, the impact in views from the road junction and from Forest Road would be considerable as the rear extensions would not be subservient to the host building.
8. Overall, I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building, and on the significance of the Conservation Area. Whilst the harm would be less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm, including the contribution that the development would make to the local housing supply. The development would not preserve the character and appearance of the Queensbridge Road Conservation Area or the setting of the Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area. Consequently, it would fail to comply with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan, Policies 24 and 25 of the Hackney Core Strategy (2010), Policies DM1, DM2 and DM28 of the Hackney Development Management Local Plan 2017, and the guidance of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (2009) which, in combination, seeks to promote high quality design that reflects the local context, whilst also protecting the significance of heritage assets.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector