
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/21/3281988

192 Millfields Road, Hackney, London E5 0AR

- 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 Ms A Torres against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/1911, dated 15 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a mansard roof extension at 192 Millfields Road, Hackney, London E5 0AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/1911, dated 15 June 2021, 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: Drg Nos 327_BL_01, 327_SL_01, 327_EX_01, 327_EX_02, 327_EX_03, 327_EX_04, 327_EX_05, 327_EX_06, 327_EX_07, 327_EX_08, 327_PR_01, 327_PR_02, 327_PR_03, 327_PR_04, 327_PR_05, 327_PR_06, 327_PR_07, 327_PR_08, and 327_PR_09.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external brick surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 192 Millfields Road and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. This stretch of Millfields Road is residential in character with principally two-storey, terraced dwellings to the south side dating from the Victorian period.

On the opposite side of the road is a large expanse of public open space known as Millfields Park. No 192 is located within a terrace of nine buildings in total that spans the length of Millfields Road between Sewdley Street and Chippendale Street. In-keeping with most other properties within the terrace, the appeal property has a butterfly roof that is concealed behind a front parapet. The proposal would raise the party wall parapets to each side and fill the space between with a mansard-style roof extension with a shallow pitched face and vertical wall to the front, set in excess of 1m behind the front parapet, and with a steeper pitch to the rear.

4. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD) was approved in April 2009 and provides guidance for undertaking extensions and alterations to private dwellings within the Borough. Part 3 includes design guidelines for roof extensions and alterations, including mansard roofs. It notes that the continuity of the parapet line is an important townscape feature of early/mid Victorian streets and is typical of the street scene for large areas of Hackney. As a consequence, the SPD advises that roof extensions are not normally acceptable in those terraces where an unbroken roof line remains.
5. In this case, the terrace has a number of irregularities. No 188 on the corner with Sewdley Street noticeably steps higher than the attached neighbour at No 190. There is no single continuous parapet height for the whole terrace, with Nos 196, 198, 200, and 202 all stepped higher than the next. The cornice details on the front parapets are mixed, and the end property on the corner with Chippendale Street is a contemporary three-storey building. The terrace does not have a uniform appearance that in my view may otherwise leave it vulnerable to change.
6. In addition, mansard roof extensions are part of the immediate area's established character. There are examples at Nos 184 and 186 Millfields Road. These are part of the terraced street scene and sit in a row of similar dwellings that extend past the junction with Sewdley Street. A further example exists at No 172. In the opposite direction past the junction with Chippendale Street is a further example at No 222 on a very similar terraced row. Apart from that at No 186, which has a very noticeable presence, these other examples have roof extensions that have broken the original roof line but none are obvious from street level along Millfields Road. The original parapet walls are all intact and only with the deliberate intention of detecting their presence was I able to see the altered roof form in longer distance views from Millfields Park. They have become part of the established street scene and in my assessment, they have had no significant impact upon the character or appearance of the original dwellings or the wider area. The purpose of the SPD to create a high-quality, sustainable built environment is clear and understood. I recognise the potential for harm from insensitive roof alterations and the need to guard against them. However, in my judgement, this is an occasion where the introduction of a roof extension for No 192 would be acceptable, being consistent with the other examples nearby that demonstrate how sensitive roof extensions can be successfully assimilated into an area.
7. The appeal proposal would be recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation with the parapet wall retained intact. The depth of the recess, combined with the shallow pitch of the front roof slope would ensure that the roof addition

would be out of sight from street level along Millfields Road. Longer distance views would reveal its presence, but in my opinion, it would not be seen as an incongruous addition. The butterfly roof profile would be retained to the rear, in accordance with the SPD's guidance. My impression overall is that the proposal would have no detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of No 192, the terrace, or the wider street scene. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would display the design quality that is required by Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (adopted July 2020) in order for it to respond positively to local character and context, and with Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 (LP 2021), which requires development to respond to the existing character of a place and to be of high quality.

Other Matters

8. I have noted some concern expressed by a neighbouring occupier to the rear. I am satisfied that the new rear facing windows at roof level would be positioned sufficiently far from any properties to the rear to avoid any overlooking or loss of privacy. There is no evidence to suggest that the increased height of No 192 would impact upon levels of light to any adjoining or nearby properties. Whilst it may be the case that long distance sight of trees in Millfields Park may possibly be affected from some vantage points, I have found that the development itself would not appear intrusive or incongruous within its context.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. The roof to the mansard extension is proposed to be finished with zinc cladding. Given that I have found that the addition would be largely inconspicuous I am satisfied that this would be an appropriate finish, although in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the works involving alterations to the existing brickwork are finished with materials that would match the existing house.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR