
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: 23 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/21/3272835

81 Chatsworth Road, Hackney, London E5 0LH

- 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 Kirwan against the decision of the London Borough of Hackney Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0360, dated 7 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'erection of mansard roof extension'.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 1 December 2021.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The above development description is the wording that appears on the decision notice and on the appellant's appeal form. It is different to the wording employed in the original application form. However, I am satisfied that the description wording used in the decision notice adequately captures the development proposed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. No 81 Chatsworth Road is a 3 storey terraced property which comprises a ground floor shop with 2 flats above, 1 on the first floor and the other on the second floor. It sits within a terrace of 6 properties which runs roughly northwards from the junction with Blurton Road to the grounds of a primary school which is just beyond No 83. The properties within the terrace are similar in having ground floor commercial uses with living accommodation on the upper floors, a pattern which is common elsewhere along Chatsworth Road, which is a busy commercial street.
5. Although the terrace has been altered, with ground floor modern shopfronts and some replacement modern windows at the upper levels, it retains an

attractive period character. The walls are built in traditional brickwork, the window openings have distinctive painted lintels, and the top of the front (street) elevation is defined by cornice features and parapet walls which step down with each unit, reflecting the gentle fall in the street northwards towards the school. Behind the parapet walls are traditional 'butterfly' roofs, which remain intact on 5 of the 6 properties, the exception being No 83, where the pitched butterfly roof form appears to have been replaced by a flat roof structure. The butterfly roof forms cannot be seen from Chatsworth Road, but they are visible in from Blurton Road to the south.

6. The appeal proposal would introduce a roof extension that would accommodate 2 bedrooms and a shower room. This would entail a mansard type structure at the front and rear of the property. The front roof extension would be set back a short distance behind the parapet wall and would include 2 windows. The rear mansard structure would also be set back a short distance behind the V shaped profile of the rear building elevation. The side walls, which currently enclose the butterfly roof structure, would be raised in height by over 1 metre to enclose the roof extensions.
7. When viewed from a position directly in front of the site on Chatsworth Road, the additional accommodation would only be partly visible and the existing parapet wall would help to reduce its impact. However, it would still be visible and apparent in angled views from further along Chatsworth Road. It would appear as a bulky addition and, being the only such structure in the terrace, it would stand out as a discordant and incongruent addition.
8. The rear of the building is visible in a glimpsed view from Blurton Road and from this location the rear mansard structure would look particularly imposing. It would disrupt the largely intact butterfly roofscape of the terrace and rise above it, failing to successfully integrate with the building and its context.
9. I have noted the appellant's submissions concerning other mansard roof extensions at other properties along Chatsworth Road. I viewed these on my site inspection, but I do not have full details of each case before me, although many of these additions appear to have been in place for some time. In any event, the circumstances and issues are different in each case and I must make my assessment on the particular planning merits of the current proposal.
10. 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 a high quality design. It also conflicts with the Hackney Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2009) which guides against mansard roof extensions in terraces where an unbroken roofline remains. The proposal would also fail the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requirement that development should add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture.
11. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

P. Staddon

INSPECTOR