

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/21/3282737
24 Cecilia Road, Hackney, London E8 2EP

- 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 Bredenkamp against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/1878, dated 9 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a hip to gable extension and rooflights to front and rear slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the St Mark's Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace, three-storey building with lower ground, ground, and first floors, and with further accommodation at second floor level within the existing roof space. The dwelling has a pitched, hipped roof and occupies a corner plot on the south-east side of a crossroads junction where Cecilia Road is bisected by Montague Road to the east and Colvestone Crescent to the west. The site lies within the St Mark's Conservation Area, a cohesive mid-Victorian residential estate that is recognised within the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as being of exceptional quality. The CAA identifies all of the terraced properties along Cecilia Road of townscape merit, being well-detailed examples of late 19th Century houses, which retain their original detailing. No 24 is a case in point; a prominent building of strong architectural design that makes a positive contribution to the unified form of the architecture in the area.
4. The appeal proposal would change the existing hipped roof arrangement with a new gable extension to the side elevation facing Montague Road. New

conservation style rooflights would be inserted in the front and rear roof slopes, with materials of construction to match the existing building.

5. 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 change from a hipped to a gabled roof. It advises that it is not normally acceptable to change from a hipped to a gabled roof, particularly where the house forms part of a semi-detached pair or the house is at the end of a terrace. The proposal would conflict with advice within the SPD, falling into a category that would not normally be acceptable.
6. The appellant has highlighted that the terrace belonging to No 24 is fairly long, comprising eleven dwellings (Nos 4-24 even). This has been depicted in existing and proposed street elevations. I share the appellant's view that the change to the roof form of the appeal property would not harm any balance to the terrace for two reasons. There is a hipped roof to No 12 that matches No 24. However, any balancing effect with No 24 is lost by reason of distance and No 12's physical attachment to No 10 and beyond, where these properties at the opposite end of the terrace take on a different form in terms of height, appearance, and roof configuration. Secondly, due to physical limitations created by the layout of the surrounding development and street patterns, the full width of the terrace would never be seen as a single entity. Notwithstanding this, the individual form of No 24 is visually prominent from ground level when seen in closer views along Cecilia Road, and more significantly when seen from both Montague Road and Colvestone Crescent. In this context, No 24 has a very distinct association with the dwellings on the other three corners of the road junction.
7. No 26 Cecilia Road, opposite the appeal property to the north, has an exposed gable end facing Montague Road as part of its original design. I accept that, when seen in isolation, a new gable to No 24 may appear to bring a sense of balance by creating a mirror image with No 26. However, this is an oversimplification of the wider context where there is an obvious unity between the forms of the buildings on all four corners of the crossroads junction. The hipped roof form of No 24 mirrors the hipped roof form of No 23 which sits directly opposite on the west side of Cecilia Road. The gabled form of No 26 mirrors the gabled form of No 25 which similarly sits opposite. Because of the interjection by Colvestone Crescent and Montague Road within the Cecilia Road street scene, these specific relationships are openly seen from ground level and appreciated as part of a coherent design that is reflective of the wider area. The change to the roof profile at No 24 would disrupt this harmony. This would detract from the unified form of the architecture to the detriment of the character and appearance of the conservation area.
8. The appellant has argued that the proposal would ensure the upkeep of the property in the public interest. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the property could only be maintained by executing a hip to gable change. I do not share the appellant's view that the change would improve the look of the property; there is no identified harm from the original hipped roof form of the building. The development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area as a heritage asset, but there are no

public benefits that would outweigh this harm. In this regard there would be clear conflict with Policy LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (adopted July 2020) and part C of Policy HC1 of The London Plan 2021. For these same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

9. I have noted examples given by the appellant of other hip to gable alterations along Cecilia Road but none are comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of setting, context, or visual impact. These other examples do not alter my findings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR