
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Paul Singleton BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/17/3175322
165 Brooke Road, Hackney, London E5 8AG

- 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 & Mrs Julius Adedipe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2016/1356, dated 16 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor level and mansard roof extension to main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area having regard to its location within a conservation area.

Reasons

3. The proposed mansard roof would be set back by a minimum of 0.78 metre behind the front parapet. It would largely be hidden in direct views from the other side of Brooke Road but would be seen from the upper floor windows of houses opposite. In my assessment it would also be visible in medium distance views from further along the street. As no mansard roofs are currently visible in these views, it would appear as an incongruous addition and would interrupt the unbroken parapet roofline which is a feature both of the terrace in which the appeal property is located and of the adjacent terrace to the east.
4. The visual effect would be greater when seen from the north east. Due to the alignment of Ickburgh Road and the appeal property's location its roof and that of the adjacent dwelling at No. 167 are central in the view of anyone approaching the junction with Brooke Road. Given the large numbers of people likely to be walking or passing on Ickburgh Road this is a public view. As the mansard would be set in from the rear wall by only a minimal degree, its full height and length would be readily appreciable. The proposed extension would appear as a large and bulky addition which would disrupt the traditional butterfly roof form. I therefore find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property.

5. Brooke Road is a long road with a wide range of houses of varied design. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of houses of the same age and style and this same style is repeated in the terrace to the east. In addition to the standard size, spacing and rhythm of the first floor windows the uniform character and appearance of these terraces is largely defined by the continuous parapet to the front elevation. The deep rendered parapet and the horizontal banding that separates it from the first floor elevation below create a strong horizontal emphasis to these terraces and draw the eye to this aspect of their appearance.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) (SPD) states that the continuity of the parapet line is an important townscape feature of such terraces. It is for this reason that the SPD advises that roof extensions are not normally acceptable where an unbroken roofline remains as is the case in respect of the terrace in which the property stands. The proposal would result in an unwelcome interruption to that unbroken roofline and would reduce the positive contribution that the terrace makes to the street scene. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the guidance in the SPD.
7. The Northwold and Cazenove Conservation Area is extensive and includes a range of dwellings and other buildings of varied architectural style and design. However, there is a general pattern of properties of similar age and appearance being grouped together in individual streets or sections of the longer residential roads. This pattern is reflected in these two terraces and in other groups of dwellings on Brooke Road. The uniformity of roof form and pitch within such building groups makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although some individual examples may possibly be found mansard roof extensions are not a traditional feature of the Conservation Area.
8. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The proposal would not make a positive contribution in this regard and the interruption to the uniform appearance of the terrace would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. That harm would be less than substantial having regard to section 12 of the Framework and, as the main impact would be in views from a side street rather than from the front of the dwelling, would be of only a moderate scale.
9. Paragraph 134 states that, where less than substantial harm would be caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No public benefits have been identified and the proposal, therefore, conflicts with paragraph 134.
10. The proposal also conflicts with Policies 24 and 25 of the London Borough of Hackney Core Strategy (2010), which respectively seek that all development should enrich and enhance the built environment and make a positive contribution to the character of the historic environment. It also conflicts with Development Management Local Plan (2015) Policy DM2, which states that development should be appropriate to its location, and DM8, which requires that development within a conservation area should preserve or enhance the

character and appearance of the area. Conflict also arises with The London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4, and 7.8 which seek that development should have regard to local character and should conserve heritage assets. I have not identified any harm to the public realm and do not find any conflict with London Plan Policy 7.6.

11. The additional living accommodation provided would be of advantage to the appellant. However this would be a private benefit that would not outweigh the harm that would be caused.

Other Matters

12. I note that appellant's reference to roof extensions approved elsewhere in the local area but do not accept that these are a precedent for the appeal proposal. The properties at 54-56 Brooke Road do not have a parapet roof form and the same issues would not arise. The houses in Walsingham Road have this roof form but their rear elevations appear not to be visible from the street or other public realm. If the extensions are rear roof extensions they would not have the same prominence and visibility as the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Paul Singleton

INSPECTOR