



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by **B Bowker Mplan MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 17th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/17/3179386

Flat B, 84 Prince George Road, Hackney, London N16 8BY

- 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 Grant Ibbs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2016/4156, dated 6 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as *'change of front pitched hip roof on the south elevation to include a gable extension and to have one roof light, on the left hand side of the front South elevation moved to the side West elevation, and the second roof light on the right hand side of the south elevation moved up'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed development described as *'change of front pitched hip roof on the south elevation to include a gable extension and to have one roof light, on the left hand side of the front South elevation moved to the side West elevation, and the second roof light on the right hand side of the south elevation moved up'*, at Flat B, 84 Prince George Road, Hackney, London N16 8BY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/4156, dated 6 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block/Site Plan, Existing Site & Location Plan drawing no 133_101, Existing Elevations & Sections A-A drawing no 133_003, Existing Floor and Roof Plans drawing no 133_101, Existing Elevations & Sections A-A drawing no 133_102, Proposed Elevations & Sections A-A drawing no 133_102, Proposed 3D render drawing no 133_103, Proposed Site & Location Plan with Aerial View drawing no 133_101.
 - 3) Materials used in the construction of the external roof surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building 84 Prince George Road.

Preliminary Matter

2. I understand that the rear dormer roof extension benefits from planning permission and I saw that it had been constructed during my site visit. In

addition, the Council raise no objection to the proposed roof lights which form part of the appeal proposal.

3. Based on all I have seen and read, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's acceptance of these elements of the appeal. Consequently my decision below focusses on the roof alteration proposed to the front of the appeal property.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No 84 Prince George Road comprises a two storey Victorian end of terrace property, occupying a corner location visible from both Prince George Road and Wordsworth Road. The Baptist Church and Electricity Sub Station are to the west of the site and are both locally listed.
6. During my site visit I saw that a large number of terraced residential properties along Prince George Road, including those within the vicinity of the site, contained polygon roof additions. These roof additions have been designed to cap and thus form part of a wider single width projecting bay. Unlike surrounding terraced residential properties, No 84 does not have a bay window. Despite this, the proposed roof alteration would be viewed alongside similar sized roof features along Prince George Road. As such, the absence of a bay window at no 84 would not be readily apparent nor a harmful sight when made. Furthermore, the proposal would complement and give the appeal property an appearance similar to the corner property opposite the site at No 109.
7. The proposal would be in scale with and proportionate to the existing roof, which in conjunction with the use of matching roof materials (secured by way of planning condition), would ensure that the existing character of the host property is retained. Consequently the proposal would not look incongruous or uncharacteristic in the context of the host building or its surroundings. Thus I cannot agree with the Council that the proposal would strip the host building of its architectural context. As the front roof alteration would face away from the Baptist Church and Electricity Sub Station, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on both locally listed buildings.
8. In reaching this view I have taken into account the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Of relevance, the SPD requires roof extensions to be designed to complement the individual house and existing streetscape. I also note that Policy DM1 of the Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) requires development to retain characteristic rooflines that make a contribution to the character of the area and optimise the distinctive character of the existing building. Based on my reasoning above the proposal would complement the character of the host building and of those in the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would comply with the above noted requirements.
9. Therefore the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy 24 of the Core Strategy, Policy

DM1 of the DMLP, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. Combined these policies require development to be of high quality design that enriches local distinctiveness and identifies with the character of the surrounding environment and buildings.

Conditions

10. No suggested conditions have been provided by the Council. Nonetheless, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the above noted conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR