
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/19/3234706
139 Dunlace Road, London E5 0NG

- 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 Alex Jasper and Ms Vicky Burke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2019/1518, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building, its wider terrace and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey end of terrace, single family dwelling, situated within a residential area. The terrace contains butterfly roofs concealed behind corniced parapets. The side elevation of the host property presents as a plain brick parapet and is highly visible in the street scene, when approaching from Glyn Road.
4. A small number of properties within the same terrace as the appeal building have been subject to the addition of mansard style roof extensions. However, where those exist, they are situated in mid-terrace positions and, I observed, are barely visible in the street scene as a result of the parapet at the front of the buildings and the width of the street. Those existing extensions have therefore had minimal impact on the character of the terrace and its surroundings.
5. In contrast, because of its end of terrace position, the proposed development would be highly visible, particularly from Glyn Road where it would be viewed in conjunction with the terrace end at the junction of Dunlace Road and Glyn Road, which is of similar profile to the existing appeal building. Notwithstanding that the predominant height of the extension would be delivered to the rear of the property, the proposed alteration to the flank wall would give rise to an entirely different roofscape to the end part of the terrace. Despite the use of matching materials, the resultant alteration would be an unduly dominant

feature which would erode the simplicity of the existing roof form. The existence of other roof extensions in different circumstances in the wider vicinity of the appeal site do not alter my conclusions with regard to the particular harm I have identified in this case.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building, its wider terrace and the street scene. Thus, it would conflict with Policy 24 of the Hackney Core Strategy (2010) and the Hackney Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations (2009), and with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016). Those policies seek to secure high quality design and, amongst other things, require development to respect the visual integrity and established architectural character of the surrounding environment.

Other Matters

7. The development would provide additional accommodation within an existing family home. However, the benefits in that regard would be limited to that single existing property, and any benefits to housing supply would be very modest and insufficient to outweigh the harm to character and appearance that I have identified.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

S Tudhope
Inspector