



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/21/3285460

24 Harrington Hill, Hackney, London E5 9EY

- 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 Ms A. Yeter against the decision of the London Borough of Hackney Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2540, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard-style roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 Matter

3. In the interest of accuracy, the description of development in the header above is based on how it appears on the decision notice and appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. Harrington Hill and the surrounding area has a varied urban form with a mix of terraced two-storey dwellings, residential tower blocks and other 3-4 storey apartment blocks. The appeal property is a relatively modern building which sits on the same building line as the terraced properties directly to the east. Although it features small dormer windows within the front roof slope, its pitched roof reflects a consistency of design and form with the neighbouring terraced properties which all have pitched roofs, creating a coherent uniformity to the pattern of development in this section of the road.
 6. The resultant roof profile, with the added mansard element, would jar with the other terraced properties in the vicinity which have all maintained their original
-

pitched roofscapes and coherent roof lines. In light of its contrasting mansard design, the proposed roof extension would also unbalance the building it forms part of with the attached property at No.22 which has a pitched roof. The proposal would appear visually intrusive in this respect and constitute an awkward and incongruous addition. I find it would unduly increase the prominence of the dwelling in the street scene and erode the coherent uniform character of this section of Harrington Hill.

7. I do not have the full details of the lapsed planning permission (ref 2012/3880) referred to by the appellant. However, it is evident that the earlier approved mansard roof extension also included the alteration of No.22's roof, which differs significantly in context from the current scheme. As stated above, the sole alteration of No.24 would result in a building with a disjointed appearance which would adversely impact the character of the area. The reference to this application therefore does not lend any significant positive weight in favour of the proposal.
8. Given the above, the proposed roof extension would constitute an incongruous development and would harm the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan, Policy D4 of the London Plan, and the 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document, which together seek to ensure the delivery of well-designed developments respectful of local context.

Other Matters

9. I recognise that the development would provide additional accommodation and workspace for occupiers. However, whilst this would be a private benefit which would attract a very limited amount of weight in support of the proposal, this would be insufficient to outweigh the harm which I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant refers to paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that where no up to date development plan is in place, permission should be granted unless there is a clear reason for refusing development or the adverse impacts outweigh the benefits. However, no evidence has been adduced to clearly demonstrate that the Hackney Local Plan (2020) is not up to date. Similarly, references to paragraph 85 of the NPPF are not relevant as the appeal site is not located in a town centre.

Recommendation

11. The development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR