



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: 1 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/21/3288556

58B Parkholme Road, Hackney, London E8 3AQ

- 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 Mr Stephen Reynolds against the decision of London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/1124, dated 10 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is single level side extension to 58a and 2 storey side extension to 58B to include cycle store.
-

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 area is characterised by groups of terraces, which by virtue of their uniform appearance and form create a rhythmic pattern of development. Although materials and architectural detailing vary along Parkholme Road, 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 comprises a 3-storey dwelling located at the end of a small terrace which occupies a prominent location on a curved part of the street, emphasised further by the angular orientation of the building. Although a more recent addition to the area, the proportions, scale and style of the terrace is reflective of the traditional properties adjacent to the site and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development seeks to infill the existing gap which lies between the appeal property and No 58A Parkholme Road. Amongst the traditional terraces, No 58A is somewhat of an anomaly in terms of its scale and appearance and is distinctly different to the appeal property. Nevertheless, the existing gap, albeit partly enclosed at street level safeguards the homogeneity of the area by allowing for these contrasting built forms to stand alone.
6. In linking the 2 properties, the design of the proposed extension attempts to relate to the individual character of both, however does neither successfully. In particular, the introduction of a flat roof would be uncharacteristic of the area whilst the varying

design and height of the structures and enclosure of the existing gap would undermine the rhythm and proportions of the existing terrace. Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged that the overall scale of the proposed development would be subservient, that sympathetic materials including fenestration would be used and that the proposed siting would generally be in keeping with the existing building line, the development would read as a visually intrusive and incongruous form of development.

7. Although the proposed development would not necessitate the removal of existing landscaping or impede any local or protected views, it would nonetheless be viewed as a dominant addition, detrimental to the street scene. As such, limited weight is attributed to these factors.
8. The Council's delegated report and decision notice allege conflict with Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2020 which amongst other aspects, seek to ensure the delivery of well-designed schemes. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's comments regarding the strategic nature of these policies, the design guidance therein is nevertheless relevant.
9. I have had regard to the statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. For the reasons outlined, the proposed development would adversely affect the appearance of the appeal property and the rhythm of the wider terrace, failing to preserve or enhance the character or 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.
10. 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. The proposed hoist would improve accessibility to the property and also enhance the local housing stock which could be considered to be a public benefit. Nevertheless, as considerable weight and importance is attributed to the statutory duty outlined above, it would be insufficient to outweigh the harm identified.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA contrary to Policies D4, D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 together with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP17 of the Hackney Local Plan. Amongst other aspects, these policies seek to ensure that development responds 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 Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations 2009 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. It would also fail to comply with the design objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. In concluding this appeal, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, including the Framework, the appeal is dismissed.

H Wilkinson

INSPECTOR