



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/23/3330499

21 Linscott Road, Hackney, London E5 0RD

- 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 Graham Pontin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2023/1695, dated 24 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a bike storage unit with planter and gate to the front of the property of a terrace house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a bike storage unit with planter and gate to the front of the property of a terrace house at 21 Linscott Road, Hackney, London E5 0RD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/1695, dated 24 July 2023, 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: SP-00; SP-0.1; SP-01; SP-02; SP-03; SP-04; SP-05; SP-06; SP-07; SP-08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those materials shown and specified on the approved plans and the planning application form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site is located towards the end of a terraced row of houses and one arm of the Linscott Road cul-de-sac. The houses have relatively consistent features including attractive bays, window surrounds and porch detailing. The properties all have modest front gardens. There is some variety in the designs and materials used in the boundary treatments enclosing the gardens, albeit most feature low brick walls. Until recently No 21 also featured a low front wall, but it had been removed when I visited. The road otherwise features terraced townhouses that largely have low front boundary walls of differing designs and materials, as well as a flat block with a front boundary hedge. Notably, I saw storage units that appear to be designed to accommodate cycles and other

household items located behind and projecting above the boundary walls of Nos 7, 9 and 17, with the latter being in the same terrace as No 21. A cycle store was also evident in the highway.

4. The proposed storage unit would act as the site's front boundary except where a gate is proposed. The former would be taller than the adjacent boundary walls but nevertheless a modest structure that would be subordinate to the house, proportionate to the front garden's size and comparable in height to the other storage units identified. While its timber clad and metal finish would not be typical of the materials used for boundary treatments in the vicinity, there is sufficient variation in the front gardens and their enclosures along the road to accommodate its appearance. Any landscaping in its planter box top would be compatible with the varying vegetation behind front boundaries elsewhere along the road. The terrace's features would continue to be appreciable and its consistency would be preserved overall. Moreover, the storage unit would not dominate or appear incongruous within the streetscene as a result of its size, siting or design. Similarly, the gate would be consistent with others nearby.
5. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document sets out that low brick walls are characteristic of Hackney's streetscape, and that where walls and gates are to be replaced care should be taken to respect the original character, height and materials of the boundary treatment and the surrounding streetscape. I have had due regard to the guidance and, for the reasons identified, find that the prevailing character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area would be respected and maintained.
6. The proposal therefore accords with Hackney Local Plan Policy LP1, which sets out criteria relating to design quality and local character. In addition, there is no conflict with London Plan Policy D4, which relates principally to methods of design analysis and maintaining design quality.

Other Matters

7. The Salvation Army Congress Hall and its gates and forecourt walls are Grade II listed buildings located at the end of the other arm to Linscott Road. Due to the scale of the scheme, its distance from those listed buildings, and an intervening wall, their special interest and significance would be preserved.
8. The standard time and approved plans conditions are necessary in the interests of certainty. A further condition is needed to require that the development be finished in the materials shown on the plans and stated on the application form in the interest of protecting the character and appearance of the area. The site is at high risk of surface water flooding and the Council recommends a condition to require drainage details to be provided for approval to mitigate flood risk. However, the front garden is currently mostly hardstanding and thus soft landscaping within the planter would likely provide mitigation. In that context, I am not satisfied that the condition is necessary.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR