



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2021

by J Hunter BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/21/3270474

48 Firsby Road, London N16 6QA

- 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 Glick against the decision of London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/0020, dated 6 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of a single-storey side extension to create ancillary floor area for the existing synagogue (use class F1(f)).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted plans indicate that a single garage is located in roughly the same location as the proposed extension. However, I saw during my site visit that the garage is no longer there. I am therefore determining the appeal on that basis.
3. The description of development contained within the appeal form and the Council's decision notice differs from that contained within the application form although Part E of the appeal form indicates that the description has not changed. Nonetheless, I have used the description provided in the appeal form and decision notice in the banner heading above as it better describes the proposal in the context that the previously existing garage is no longer on site.
4. During the course of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated. The main parties were given the opportunity to make comment on the new policies and therefore I am content that neither party was prejudiced.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a substantial semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. The property has a relatively tall front boundary which consists of a brick wall with decorative railings on top.

7. The proposal would see the construction of a single storey side extension that would project approximately 1.6 metres forward of the principal elevation of the appeal property but set back from the front boundary by 1 metre.
8. The extension would be of a simple flat roofed design with two appropriately proportioned windows in the front elevation. The submitted information indicates that the finishing materials would match those used in the existing building.
9. The appeal property lies at the northern end of a curved street of semi-detached and terraced properties with a strong, established, building line. The proposed extension, by way of its significant projection forward of the building line would appear bulky and incongruous in the street scene thus causing harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In this regard, the proposal would conflict with the requirements of Policies D3 of the London Plan 2021 and LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2020. These policies seek to, amongst other things, promote good design that reflects local character.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that there is another forward projecting single storey side extension at no 40 Firsby Road although it does not project as far forward as the extension proposed in this appeal. In any event, I must determine this appeal on its own merits and the presence of another extension of a similar design does not justify further harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. I am mindful that the proposed extension would benefit the users of the building by providing additional internal space however, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

J Hunter

INSPECTOR