

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/19/3227491

19 Haberdasher Street, London N1 6ED

- 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 Noel Haynes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2018/4162, dated 13 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion, extension at second floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a mostly residential area and sits centrally within a line of 5 buildings that have a similar height and appearance. The line of buildings has a uniform character, albeit the building that the appeal site is part of is wider. Within the locality is a mixture of tall buildings and terraces of varying heights that contain flats and houses.
4. The building at the appeal site contains maisonettes. To the rear of the building are two shallow projections which are elevated above ground level and supported by columns. Their roof is formed from the continuation of the main roof and includes a single dormer window. These projections are repeated along the line of similar buildings and this creates a degree of uniformity to the rear of the built form which can be seen from the adjacent car parking area and flats.
5. The proposed extension would involve the increase of the height of the rear projections and the alteration of the roof, resulting in a second floor rear extension with a flat roof that would be slightly lower than the ridge of the existing roof. The extension would utilise materials that match the existing building and correlate with the shape of the existing rear elevation.
6. The extension would result in the rear projection exceeding the height of the eaves and would therefore result in the loss of the majority of the eaves detail, which is an important architectural feature of the building. The height, the flat roof form and the width across the majority of the existing building would

cause the extension to have a particularly bulky appearance that would be dominating of the rear elevation. The resultant building would be harmfully at odds with the character and appearance of the group of similar buildings and this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the locality.

7. The appellant has provided details of an alternative roof extension at the site that benefits from planning permission. However, that extension would not be of the same scale and bulk and, whilst it would change the appearance of the building, it would not dominate the existing building to the same extent. The existence of that permission does not therefore alter the weight that I afford to the harm that would be caused by the proposed development
8. It has been drawn to my attention that other buildings within the locality have been extended, but the buildings effected by those extensions are materially different in character and appearance to the building at the appeal site. The presence of significantly different extensions does not therefore alter the weight I afford to the harm that would be caused by the proposal.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 24 of the Hackney Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2010) and policy DM1 of the Hackney Development Management Local Plan (2015) which require that, amongst other things, development respects the architecture and character of the surrounding area and the visual integrity, scale, massing and rhythm of a building and any groups of buildings. The proposal is also contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which require development to be of high design quality, complimentary to local architectural character and well related to existing streets in terms of scale, proportion and mass.
10. The proposal is also contrary to the Hackney Local Development Framework Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) which states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the principal building and be designed to respect the character and size of the original property.

Other Matter

11. The appellant has identified that the Hackney Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2011) provides some encouragement for the extension of dwellings to address circumstances of housing being unsuitable for its occupiers. In this regard I note that the appellant wishes to extend the property to provide additional space for his family and that this aim has been supported by an interested party. However, based on the evidence before me, I consider that the benefits arising to the appellant do not outweigh the harm that has been identified above in relation to the effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR