



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

**by H Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 October 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/22/3294138**

**30 Parkholme Road, Hackney, London E8 3AG**

- 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 Dan Reynolds of Grade 8 Properties Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Hackney.
  - The application Ref 2021/2786, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2021.
  - The development proposed is erection of a ground floor full width rear extension and a first floor half-width rear extension. Sub-division of the rear garden to provide separate private amenity space for each flat.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area (CA) is characterised by buildings dating from a relatively short space of time in the Victorian Period. The character of Parkholme Road is largely derived from groups of terraces, which by virtue of their uniform appearance and form create a rhythmic pattern of development. While architectural detailing and materials vary, the uniformity of proportion, scale and style of the built fabric is an overriding and notable feature of the CA and contributes to its overall significance.
4. The appeal property lies on the eastern side of Parkholme Road and comprises a 3-storey end of terrace. Although it is acknowledged that the rear of properties within neighbouring terraces have been altered and extended, the rear elevation of the host terrace is largely unaltered. Whilst 2 storey in height, the neighbouring extensions observed on my site visit are generally simplistic in design, are of a uniform width and predominantly feature mono-pitched roofs. They therefore do not compare to the appeal proposal.
5. Despite being subservient, by virtue of its design, the proposed extension would disrupt the homogeneity and rhythm of the terrace in which the appeal property lies. Although the appeal property has a main hipped roof, when taken together with the half-width first storey, the hipped roof form would result in an extension whose overall form and shape would appear at odds with the

otherwise simplistic and uniform appearance of the host terrace. It would sit uncomfortably on the rear elevation, so closely related to the adjoining window details above and to the east. Moreover, the proposed fenestration in size and form would not relate well to the host property. As such, the proposed development would read as a visually intrusive and incongruous addition.

6. It is acknowledged that Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan (LP) 2020 together with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2009 (SPD) do not prohibit first floor extensions. Indeed, in this instance, it is not the principle of development in dispute, but the design. In accordance with the above, there is an expectation that proposals affecting the Conservation Area preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area, having regard to historical form and rhythm. Whilst the overall dimensions of the proposal may be generally consistent with the SPD and the use of matching materials including fenestration could be conditioned, the overall form of the appeal proposal would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It therefore does not represent good design.
7. The statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (s72) is a matter of considerable importance and weight. Although views of the proposal would be limited from the public realm, for the reasons outlined above it would nevertheless undermine the uniform appearance and form of the host terrace, weakening its contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The appeal proposal would therefore have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in less than substantial harm in the Framework's terms given the small-scale nature of the proposal. Where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, no public benefits have been put forward to weigh against the harm identified.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA contrary to Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 together with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the LP. Amongst other aspects, these policies seek to ensure that development proposals respond to the local character and context while also preserving or enhancing the significance of the historic environment. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the SPD which seeks to ensure that proposals enhance and protect the positive qualities and characteristics of both individual dwellings and the wider townscape of which they form a part.

## **Conclusion**

9. In concluding this appeal, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, including the Framework, and my statutory duty in terms of s72, the appeal is dismissed.

*H Wilkinson*

INSPECTOR