



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2024

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/23/3329873

51 Walford Road, Hackney, London N16 8EF

- 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 Victor Btsh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref: 2023/1576 dated 11 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as installation of new bike store and planter to front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of new bike store and planter to front garden at 51 Walford Road, Hackney, London N16 8EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 2023/1576 dated 11 July 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Location Plan: 001 and Proposed Front Area PL: PL_150.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a terrace three storey property within a predominantly residential area. There is a harmony to the architectural details of properties in the immediate area. I observed during my site visit that front boundary treatments vary within the street and include brick walls, timber fencing, hedging, rendered walls, and metal railings. I also observed large planters, bin/cycle stores and free-standing refuse bins within the front area of nearby properties.
4. The appeal site has a low-level brick wall with large hedgerow behind, this would be removed to accommodate the proposed Corten bike store. An existing

Corten bike store is in-situ within the street, the Council have confirmed this does not benefit from planning permission.

5. Whilst predominantly low brick walls are the prevalent boundary treatment within the streetscene due to the variety in design of the brick walls along with the diversity of other boundary treatments within the area and the existing structures within the front curtilages of many properties the proposed development would not be incongruous.
6. The existing wall and large hedgerow screen the front of the appeal site. Opening up of the front of the property would benefit the area, the proposed planter on top of the bike store would be a pleasant addition, and the creation of cycle storage would promote the use of sustainable forms of transport. I also note that due to the height of the proposed development the refuse bins would be screened to a degree from the streetscene.
7. I have reviewed the details for the dismissed appeal relating to a similar development at 35 Belgrade Road¹. I understand that boundary treatments in Belgrade Road almost exclusively consist of a low wall, with some instances of metal fencing. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the size of the front curtilage of No. 35 and the appeal property. On this basis whilst a similar proposal there appears to be differences between locations. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There is no conflict with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (2020); and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 which seeks amongst other things to ensure development are of a high standard, responding to local character and context.
9. There is no conflict with the Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) which seeks amongst other things to ensure boundary treatments do not detract from the overall appearance of a streetscape.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
11. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/U5360/D/21/3270806