
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2023

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/22/3313036
148 Culford Road, Hackney, London N1 4HU

- 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 M Holloway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2022/2062, dated 19 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear roof extension with associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of rear roof extension with associated works at 148 Culford Road, Hackney, London N1 4HU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2022/2062, dated 19 August 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matter

2. The site falls within the De Beauvoir Conservation Area (CA). Accordingly, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mainly 3-storey dwelling of traditional style in a terrace of mostly similar properties. It addresses Culford Road along which residential terraces predominate, which have a unity in design, scale and materials that positively contribute to an attractive streetscape. Like most other nearby properties, No 148 has a straight front parapet concealing the roof behind and a butterfly roof with its characteristic V shape at the rear.
5. From what I saw, the CA derives its significance as a designated heritage asset from the high architectural quality of the buildings within it, many of which date from the early to mid-19th Century and often address spacious tree-lined streets. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal: De Beauvoir (CAA) also draws attention to these attributes.

6. A new flat roof dormer extension is proposed that would infill part of the valley roof of No 148. It follows a proposal to introduce a mansard style roof extension as part of a larger scheme to enlarge and alter No 148 that was recently refused planning permission on application and at appeal. By substantially amending the earlier scheme, the appellant considers that the previous concerns raised have been satisfactorily addressed and resolved.
7. None of the proposal would be evident from the road given the position of the new addition behind the front parapet and below the party walls of the host building. As a result, the front parapet wall, which gives a strong horizontal emphasis to the top of the dwelling and some unity to the wider terrace, would remain visually unbroken. Consequently, the group of buildings of which No 148 forms part would continue to appear from street level to be unaltered at roof level. In those circumstances, there is no conflict with the guidance within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD) insofar as it recognises that the continuity of the parapet line is an important townscape feature of early/mid Victorian streets. Furthermore, the contribution of the appeal dwelling and the wider terrace to the local street scene would remain unchanged.
8. At the rear, the proposal would be set well back from the end of the roof. This arrangement would ensure that the butterfly roof would remain intact as a distinctive and visible feature of the roofscape. That impression would be evident in views from the rear of the site and the back gardens of nearby properties. By retaining the original butterfly roof profile in this way, the proposal accords with the advice within the Council's SPD. The use of glazing in the new rear elevation, as proposed, would also present a lightweight appearance to the proposed extension that would complement the traditional style of the butterfly roof.
9. For all these reasons, the proposed development would successfully integrate into the form and architectural design of the appeal property and be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. The character and appearance of the CA would be preserved. As such, there is no conflict with Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of The London Plan, Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 or the Council's SPD. These policies and guidance aim to make sure that all new development achieves high quality design; responds to local character, context, and distinctiveness; is compatible with the existing townscape; optimises the site's capacity; and safeguards designated heritage assets.
10. For the same reasons, the appeal scheme complies with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it aims to protect heritage assets, the statutory duty, and the content and principles set out in the CAA.
11. Reference is made to several recent planning decisions relating to roof level extensions at properties elsewhere along Culford Road, Englefield Road and on De Beauvoir Road with background details and some photographs provided. None of these properties form part of the same terrace as No 148 nor its local street scene. While there are some common features between each of these cases and the proposal, I have assessed the appeal scheme on its own merits and find it to be acceptable for the reasons given.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out below.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs 001 Revision P1, 002 Revision P1, 010 Revision P1, 011 Revision P1, 012 Revision P1, 013 Revision P1, 020 Revision P1, 021 Revision P1, 022 Revision P1, 023 Revision P1, 030 Revision P1, 031 Revision P1, 032 Revision P1, 101 Revision P1, 102 Revision P1, 103 Revision P1, 105 Revision P1, 106 Revision P1, 107 Revision P1, 108 Revision P1, 109 Revision P1, 110 Revision P1, 111 Revision P1 and 112 Revision P1.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.