
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2021

by P J Staddon BSc, Dip, MBA (Distinction), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/21/3272983

8 Green Lanes, Hackney, London N16 9NB

- 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 Ipek Tugcu against the decision of the London Borough of Hackney Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0227, dated 26 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the 'construction of a roof extension to extend the existing 1 bedroom flat into a 2 bedroom flat'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The above development description is the wording that appears on the decision notice. It is a fuller description than that which appears in the application form, which simply states 'roof extension', and I have employed it as it provides clarity on the purpose of the proposed extension.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No 8 Green Lanes is a traditional style 2 storey mid-terraced residential property which is split into 2 flats, 1 on the ground floor and the other on the first floor. It sits within a terrace of 6 properties, numbered 2 – 12 (evens) on the north side of Green Lanes. The terrace runs from the junction with Winston Road to the grounds of a health centre, which has a vehicular access and car park just to the east of No 2.
5. The terrace appears to date from the Victorian era. The original dwellings have been subject to some later external alterations, although the front elevation of the terrace retains an attractive period character. This is defined by the projecting ground floor bay windows, recessed entrance doors and uniform first floor window openings with arched lintels. The walls are built in traditional brickwork, which remains in its original form at the appeal property and Nos 10 and 12, although No 6 has been rendered and painted and Nos 4 and 2 have

had their brickwork painted over. The top of the front (street) elevation is defined by a parapet wall which is of a uniform height across the terrace, although the appeal property and No 12 appear to have lost the projecting cornice feature which runs midway along the parapet.

6. Behind the parapet walls are traditional 'butterfly' roofs, which remain intact on all of the 6 properties. The butterfly roof forms cannot be seen from Green Lanes, although chimneys and television aerials can be seen. However, the butterfly roof forms, including that of the appeal premises, can be seen from Winston Road to the west. There are also views of the roofs from the car park of the health centre to the east of No 2.
7. The appeal proposal would introduce a roof extension that would accommodate a bedroom and a WC to expand the accommodation of the existing first floor flat. This would entail extending over and above most of the area currently occupied by the butterfly roof structure.
8. At the front of the property, the extension would take the form of a pitched roof which would rise from a point just below and behind the parapet and rise to over 1 metre above it; this roof plane would contain 2 skylights. At the rear, the full property width structure would have a steep (70°) mansard roof slope, containing 2 windows sitting above the V shaped outline of the existing butterfly roof. The extension would be contained on its sides by 2 party walls which would be carried upwards. The drawings do not include stated dimensions, but these side walls would appear to rise about 1.5 metres above the height of the existing front parapet. The chimney would also be heightened to rise above the proposed extension.
9. When viewed from street level directly in front of the site in Green Lanes, the additional accommodation would not be visible, as the view would be masked by the parapet wall. However, it would be visible and apparent in angled views from further along Green Lanes, although only the very top parts would be seen. Whilst this effect would be limited, the fact that it would be the only such structure above the terrace would mean that it would appear as discordant and uncharacteristic. There would also be private views of the proposal from windows within the 4 storey properties on the south side of Green Lanes, from where I consider the structure would appear as a notable and incongruent addition above the existing terrace.
10. The rear of the building is visible in a view from Winston Road and, from this location, the large rear roof extension structure would look particularly imposing. Whilst the outline of the existing butterfly roof would be maintained, the structure would be lost and the dormer would appear as a large and imposing structure sitting above it. It would not integrate successfully in to its surroundings, given that the existing traditional roof forms, which contributes to the character of the area, are intact and unbroken in this terrace of 6 properties. I have noted the appellant's submissions that the view from Winston Road is quite limited, and that there are mansard type extensions in that street, but that does not provide a basis for allowing harmful development.
11. I have also noted, and observed on my site inspection, the other examples of roof additions, including appeal decisions, that the appellant has submitted. However, the circumstances are different in each case and none of the appeal

decisions¹ are directly comparable and identical to the appeal proposal before me. I must make my assessment on the particular planning merits of the current proposal.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and, in turn, the area. This would conflict with policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted March 2021) and policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (adopted July 2020) which seek, amongst other things, to require all developments including alterations and extensions to be of high quality design. It also conflicts with the Hackney Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2009) which guides against mansard roof extensions in traditional terraces where an unbroken roofline remains. The proposal would also fail the National Planning Policy Framework requirement that development should add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture.
13. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

P. Staddon

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/U5360/D/18/3203775