



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/21/3278218
67 Glenarm Road, Hackney, London E5 0LY

- 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 Rosie Goodwin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application ref:2021/0233, dated 13 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is mansard style roof extension to the existing property to create 2 no. new rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellants submitted revised plans to the Council (revision E) just prior to refusal of the application. Those plans involved setting the front mansard back by an additional 500 mm to ensure that it, and the party wall transition, would not be easily seen from street level. However, the revised plans were not accepted by the Council as part of the application. I must determine this appeal on the basis of the plans which were refused by the Council. To do otherwise could prejudice the interests of the Council and any third parties who would not have been consulted on the revised plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and terrace.

Reasons

4. No.67 Glenarm Road is a mid-terrace dwelling located in a residential area. The building neither listed nor in a conservation area. The terrace has a partial continuous parapet/roof line from Nos.51 to No.73. The houses in the terrace are taller between Nos.73 to No.81. From No.81 to the end of that side of Glenarm Road the terraced houses have various roof forms and sizes. On the opposite side of Glenarm Road, the terraced houses have a continuous parapet, but there are a small number of roof extensions, visible from Glenarm Road in varying degrees.

5. The Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations* supplementary planning document was adopted in 2009. This advises that older Victorian properties, particularly 2 and 3 storey terraced houses often have shallow pitched roofs (butterfly roofs) concealed behind a parapet forming a uniform cornice line on the street frontage. As this is typical of the street scene in Hackney, the guidance advises that roof extensions are not normally allowed in those terraces where an unbroken line remains. However, the guidance does not rule out roof extensions completely and it is clear that others exist in Glenarm Road.
6. The appeal building is within a section of Glenarm Road where buildings have a continuous parapet and cornice line. The form of the terrace varies, as mentioned above, and I consider that a mansard roof of the design proposed, in this particular location would not unduly disrupt the parapet and cornice line. However, the mansard would not comply with the *Residential Extensions and Alterations* supplementary planning document which advises that, for correct appearance the mansard slope should not rest on the parapet wall but should rise from a point sufficiently behind the parapet wall at both the front and back and should normally be separated from the wall by a substantial gutter.
7. The lack of a significant set-back from the parapet at the front elevation would mean that the proposed mansard roof would be more easily seen from the windows of opposing properties and possibly from the street, intruding visually within the otherwise unbroken roofline. I find, therefore, that the proposal, based on the plans refused by the Council, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building and terrace. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan regarding the design-led approach and response to local distinctiveness and with Hackney Local Plan policy LP1 regarding design quality and local character.

Other Matters

8. The Council considers that the roof extension would be a sustainable form of development and would not result in an unacceptable detrimental impact upon neighbouring occupiers in respect of provision of daylight/outlook, sense of enclosure or over-bearing impact. I see no reason to disagree in view of the scale and location of the proposed mansard and existing overlooking from other windows within the building and neighbouring buildings. The extension would use modern materials and incorporate double glazing, an air source heat pump and solar panels. It would also provide additional family accommodation.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, based on the plans refused by the Council, and for the reasons given above, on balance, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR