
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 November 2021 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/21/3280968

121 Culford Road, London N1 4HT

- 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 Iain Duncan and Gillian Duncan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/1610, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2021.
 - The development proposed on the application from is: Erection of rear roof extension with associated works
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of rear glazed roof extension and external alterations at 121 Culford Road, London, N1 4HT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/1610, dated 21 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the end of three years from the date of this permission.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing no. 2108 (PA) 01 – proposed first floor plan, drawing no. 2108 (PA) 02 – proposed shower room floor plan, drawing no. 2108 (PA) 03 – proposed roof plan, drawing no. 2108 (PA) 04 – proposed rear elevation, drawing no. 2108 (PA) 05 – proposed section A, drawing no. 2108 (PA) 06 – proposed section B, drawing no. 2108 (PA) 07 – proposed section C.

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and whether it preserves or enhances the De Beauvoir Conservation Area (CA) in which it is located.

Reasons

4. No. 121 is sited in a group of four similar terraced properties. The short terrace comprises garden fronted brick dwellings with sash windows, and stepped entrances to the upper ground floor level front entrance. The buildings are 2-storey, plus basement, with a low parapet wall at roof level to the front. Properties at either end of the terraces act as 'bookends' and slightly project forward. To the rear, at roof level, properties have butterfly roofs which create a characteristic V-shaped pattern.
5. The Council has referred to a Conservation Area Appraisal but has not provided a copy of the document. However, from the information provided elsewhere and my observations on site, the significance of the CA is derived from its surviving high-quality terraces the street patterns and houses dating from the early to mid-Victorian period, such as the appeal property and its group. The uniformity and detailing, compact front gardens and the extensive mature landscaping within the rear gardens, contribute positively to the character and appearance of this part of the CA and the CA as a whole.
6. The proposed development would introduce a small dormer into one part of the valley roof. It would be set back from the rear roof line and below the front parapet roof and would not exceed the height of the party wall. It would have a slight mono pitched roof and be constructed in a clear glazed material.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations (2009) (SPD) advises that there are several traditional roof-forms typical of houses in Hackney, including mono-pitch, gabled, hipped, butterfly (also known as a valley or 'W' roof) and mansard roofs. It notes that the continuity of the parapet line is an important feature of early/mid Victorian streets and is typical of the street scene, so roof extensions are not normally acceptable in terraces where an unbroken roof line remains.
8. In this case the parapet of the terrace is unbroken at the front as is the valley roof to the rear. The proposal would be kept low and set back from the parapet at the front and would not exceed the height of the existing party wall at the side. This would ensure that the roof extension would not be seen from Culford Road and importantly the parapet line would remain intact. To the rear, it would be set well away from the end of the roof, ensuring the retained butterfly roof form remains as the distinct and clearly visible feature of the overall roof scape.
9. In terms of materials, the SPD sets out examples of appropriate materials, however, this list is not exhaustive. The proposed materials are of a high quality and, whilst not typically considered to be of traditional stock, it is a material used throughout the area in many different forms, including the prominent and highly visible glazed side/rear extension at the neighbouring property No. 123. The use of glazing would also bring a lightweight appearance which would help to minimise the impact on the butterfly roof.
10. Whilst intermittent views of the rear roof scape from the side street, Culford Grove, are possible, these views are predominantly of the party walls and the lower part of the valley roof. Visibility of the entire rear roof scape was limited. As the proposal would be set back from the valley edge it would not appear visually prominent these viewpoints. Indeed, given the restricted views of the

entire valley roof from over the party walls, I consider that views of the proposal would be extremely limited from along Culford Grove.

11. The Council state the proposal would also be highly visible from the public realm along Ardleigh Road. However, during my site visit I did not find that views from this location were easily and freely gained. Indeed, as a result of the existing buildings and mature tall trees, views were hindered, and I found direct visibility of the appeal site difficult and forced. Furthermore, if and when fleeting views were possible, given the scale, design and use of glazed materials the proposal would not appear discordant or obtrusive for the reasons noted above.
12. Having regard to the above I find that the proposal would have a neutral effect on No. 121 and the wider area and therefore it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such it accords with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney *A Place for Everyone*, Hackney Local Plan 2033, Strategic Planning (2020), which requires all development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality and responds to and preserves the established local character. In addition, it would accord with Policies D4 and HC1 of The London Plan (2021) which seeks development to respond to the existing character of a place and be of high quality, and development that is sympathetic to CA's significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The development would also avoid conflict with the National Planning Policy Frameworks historic environment conservation requirements.

Conditions

13. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

14. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal, subject to the conditions set out.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR