



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021 by Max Webb

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/21/3278758

16 Lidfield Road, Hackney, London N16 9NA

- 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 Tobias Hopp against the decision of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/0718, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 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 16 Lidfield Road, Hackney, London N16 9NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/0718, dated 8 March 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: 2009 PA GA 0002, 2009 PA GA 2011, 2009 PA GA 2012, 2009 PA GA 2013, 2009 PA GA 2020, 2009 PA GA 2021, 2009 PA GA 2030 and 2009 PA GA 2031.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a terrace property. Numerous dwellings on this street have mansard style roof extensions, although the appeal dwelling does not. Whilst

front elevations on this street have a relatively uniform appearance, the rear elevations have a variety of projections, extensions and window types, which gives them a somewhat inconsistent appearance. The rear of properties on this street do have some features which provide coherence for the area however, such as the retention of the appearance of the traditional butterfly roofs despite mansard roof extensions.

6. The proposal seeks to install a mansard style roof extension that would feature a glass balustrade to the rear. The mansard style roof extension would be in keeping with the other mansard style roof extensions in the area. To the rear, the glass balustrade would retain the appearance of the butterfly roof form. The proposed glazing and glass balustrade would appear consistent with the large amount of glazing seen on the existing rear extension. It would thus not appear obtrusive or incompatible with the host dwelling or surrounding properties.
7. Although there are traditional style dormer windows on the rear slopes of the mansard roofs on this street, there are also other window types. For example, 18 Lidfield Road features a single large window on the rear roof slope and 14 Lidfield Road has non-traditional style windows in the mansard roof extension. There are also a variety of differing rear projections and extensions below roof level, with different levels of glazing and window styles. Thus, as the character of the rear of properties on this street is inconsistent, the glazed balustrade would not appear out of keeping.
8. Overall, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (adopted 2020) which looks to ensure development is compatible with the existing townscape. It would also comply with the aims of the Hackney Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations (adopted 2009), which seeks to ensure roof extensions complement the individual house and existing streetscape. The Council have referred to Policy D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). Policy D1 is strategic in nature and is therefore not greatly relevant to this householder development. Policy D4 refers to the design review processes for applications and is therefore also not particularly relevant to this appeal.

Conditions

9. I have recommended the standard time condition for reasons of certainty. For the same reason, I have recommended the condition regarding plans, as well as to ensure appropriate materials and level of design that protects the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR