
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/21/3286043

53 Dunsmure Road, Hackney, London N16 5PT

- 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 Jonah Perelman against the decision of London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/1366, dated 3 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 53 Dunsmure Road, Hackney, London N16 5PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/1366, dated 3 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: WG.27-29, DR.53.EX.01, DR.53.EX.02, DR.53.PR.11 and DR.53.PR.12.
 - 2) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials that match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and host terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a three-storey, mid-terrace building with a two-storey rear outrigger and additional accommodation at basement level. The building is comprised of three self-contained flats, with the proposed development intended to serve the largest of the flats which is located on the ground and first floor.
4. Planning permission¹ has previously been granted for a similar single storey rear extension at the appeal property. The appellant has stated that the proposal would be 0.8 metres greater in depth than this consented scheme.

¹ 2021/0388 (the consented scheme)

5. Although slightly greater in depth, the proposed extension would be very similar in appearance to the consented scheme as a single storey rear extension. The additional depth of 0.8 metres would not significantly alter the appearance of the rear extension or its impact on the character of the host property. Due to its similarities to the consented scheme, the proposal would therefore be a sympathetic addition to the host property.
6. The proposal would be located to the rear of the property and would not be visible within the streetscene. Although largely uniform to the front, it is noted that many of the other properties within the host terrace have undergone various extensions to the rear which are significant in size and depth. The proposal would be similar in size to existing adjacent extensions and would therefore not be an overly dominant addition to the terrace and would not appear out of keeping with the remainder of the terrace which has already been substantially altered from its original form.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area and would thus comply with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). These policies collectively seek to ensure development is compatible with the existing townscape, including urban grain, and enhances the local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through various aspects, including their scale.
8. The proposed development would also comply with the Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) which states that rear extensions must be subordinate to the principal building.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would comply with the development plan and thus the appeal should be allowed.

E Grierson

INSPECTOR