



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2023

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/23/3319665

62 Brooke Road, Hackney, London N16 7RU

- 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 Robin Bonner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref: 2022/2799, dated 15 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the "Demolition and reconstruction of a single-storey rear extension at 62 Brooke Road N16 7RU"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the demolition and reconstruction of a single-storey rear extension at 62 Brooke Road, Hackney, London N16 7RU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 2022/2799, dated 15 November 2022, 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 referenced; TQRQM22319112023732 – 62 Brooke Road - Location Plan; A100 Rev B – Existing Site Plan; A101 Rev B – Existing Ground Floor Plan; A105 Rev B – Existing Roof Plan; A110 Rev B – Existing Section AA; A111 Rev B – Existing Section BB; A120 Rev B – Existing Front and Rear Elevations; A300 Rev A – Proposal Site Plan; A301 Rev A – Proposal Ground Floor Plan; A305 Rev A – Proposal Roof Plan; A310 Rev A – Proposal Section AA; A311 Rev A – Proposal Section BB; and, A320 Rev A – Proposal Front and Rear Elevations
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Before the installation of any window, details of their materials and design, including drawings at scale of 1:10, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have amended the address in the banner from that which is on the application form to remove repetition.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the Northwold & Cazenove Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The site lies within the Northwold and Cazenove Conservation Area (NCCA), which is a Victorian suburb within Hackney. The statutory requirement¹ requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Furthermore, paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to an asset's conservation when considering the impact of a proposal on its significance. The Northwold and Cazenove Conservation Area Appraisal 2010 identifies the significance of the NCCA² as lying within the variety of individual houses and terraces, their architectural detailing, and the green and pleasant front gardens within the area.
5. The appeal site lies within a row of five terraced dwellings, the architectural detailing and features within the front elevation of the terrace has been well preserved and the grouping, along with the near identical grouping on the northern side of Brooke Road, contribute positively to the significance of the heritage asset. To the rear, the original upper-level detailing is well preserved, while at ground floor level, a number of single storey extensions and outbuildings of varying design have been erected. The rear elevation of the terrace is visible from Jenner Road, although only the upper parts of the single storey elements are generally visible due to existing boundary treatment and vegetation.
6. The scheme proposes the removal of the existing single storey lean-to and its replacement with a single storey wraparound extension. The extension would project to the rear and side of the two-storey outrigger, and includes an asymmetrical gable roof form. The extent of projection to the rear would not project beyond the depth of the existing lean-to thereby preserving the depth of dwellings within the terrace. As such I find the depth of the extension to represent a proportionate addition. While the extension would fill the width of the plot it would have modest eaves and ridge heights, set below those of the outrigger. Further, the extension includes a roof pitch which would be similar to that of the two-storey outrigger. I consider that the additional built form would be modest, while the height and scale of the extension is such that a visual hierarchy in built form would be retained. For these, reasons I consider that the extension would appear wholly subservient to the host dwelling.
7. With regard to the impact on the NCCA, the extension would not result in the loss of any existing architectural detailing of any significance, including the

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

² Paragraph 1.3 and 7.2

existing lean-to and side facing openings within the outrigger which appear to be later alterations. From Jenner Road, only the upper part of the pitched roof would be visible over the garden boundaries. Further, this would be viewed in the context of the variety of single storey extensions and structures to the rear of the terrace. I find therefore, that the extension would not appear prominent or incongruous on the surrounding area, and would conserve the character and appearance of the NCCA.

8. I am mindful of the concern raised by the Council with regard to wraparound extensions. I have had regard to the advice contained within the Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (the SPD) for extensions and find that the extension would be modest and subservient to the host dwelling and generally complies with the design guidance in this regard. Even if I were to find conflict, the content of the SPD is only guidance, and each proposal ought to be considered on its own merits, as I have done.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing building, and that of the NCCA. Therefore, the proposed development accords with Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, and Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2020, and the SPD which, together, seek to achieve high quality design and to preserve and enhance heritage assets.

Other Matters

10. The comments of neighbours are noted with regard to roof design and the removal of a chimney. As observed above, I have found the design of the extension to be acceptable, while concerns regarding future maintenance would be a matter between the occupants of both properties. Furthermore, the proposed plans appear to show the chimney between No.60 and 62 to be unaffected.

Conditions

11. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in materials of similar appearance to the existing building is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the building and Conservation Area. I have also imposed a condition requiring the details of the windows to be submitted to the Council for approval to ensure that their design and appearance are appropriate.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposals accord with the Development Plan and that the appeal is allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR