

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2024

by L Reid BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/23/3315661

50 Manse Road, Hackney, London N16 7QD

- 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 Jacob Izzi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2022/2456.
 - The development proposed is existing basement and ground floor to be extended by 3.5m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the planning application form. Although it is different to that on the Council's decision notice, no confirmation has been provided that the change to the wording of the description was agreed by both main parties.
3. The road name of the address on the appeal form is spelt differently from that on the planning application form. The appellant has confirmed that the correct spelling is on the planning application form. This matches the Council's decision notice. I have therefore used the address from the planning application form in my formal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. 50 Manse Road is a five-storey property. It is located at the end of a terrace, within a predominately residential area. The appeal relates to the basement and ground floor of the property.
6. Although there is some variation in the size of the extensions at basement level, for the most part, properties in the terrace appear to have half-width rear extensions at ground floor level. The existing rear elevation of the property reflects this design. This gives the terrace a degree of architectural unity and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The adjoining property has a three storey full-width extension. However, the Council consider this to be an isolated example. There is limited evidence before me to dispute this.
8. As the existing half-width extensions would be lost, this would disrupt the design continuity between the house and the terrace, diminishing the overall character. The proposed extension would extend the property at both the basement and ground floor levels. It would therefore be a discordant feature in this context where the general character is smaller-scale extensions at ground floor level.
9. The extension would sit just below the window cills of the first floor windows. It would extend across the full width of the property and its depth together with its height, would add additional bulk and mass. Consequently, the extension would appear out of scale with, rather than subordinate to, the property. The box-like shape and wide windows would further exacerbate the bulk of the extension. Because of its size and design, the extension would dominate the rear elevation, unacceptably impacting the appearance of the property. This would not be overcome through the use of matching materials.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033, the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2009, and the National Planning Policy Framework. Amongst other things, these policies and guidance require extensions to respond to local distinctiveness, respect architectural features, and be sympathetic to local character.
11. Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 is also referenced in the reason for refusal. However, this policy concerns the processes of design and has less relevance.

Other Matters

12. Contacting neighbours and discussions and meetings with the Council following the submission of the application would not alter my conclusions on the merits of the proposal.
13. There are no objections on transport or highway grounds. However, this is of neutral weight and would not outweigh the harm I have identified above including the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

L Reid

INSPECTOR