



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2024

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/23/3332291

30 Parkholme Road, Hackney, London E8 3AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dan Reynolds of Grade 8 Properties Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2023/1644.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building with due regard to the Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace building, one of a number of short terraces which make up the character of this part of Parkholme Road. The site is within the Graham Road and Mapledene Conservation Area (CA), and as set out in the CA Appraisal and summarised in a previous appeal decision for this site, the CA is characterised by buildings dating from a relatively short space of time in the Victorian period.
4. The character of Parkholme Road is derived from the terraces, which by virtue of their uniform appearance and form create a rhythmic pattern of development. While architectural detailing and materials vary, the uniformity of proportion, scale and style of the built fabric is an overriding and notable feature of the CA and contributes to its overall significance.
5. The rear of the terraces at first floor level and above are largely unaltered, which enables the appreciation of their built form, rhythm and contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. Although the appeal site is not readily visible from the public realm, the site and its location within the terraces is apparent in views across the garden areas of properties to the rear.
6. Within this context, the appeal proposal would appear as a clumsy box-like addition projecting above the ground floor and into the original and attractive first floor element of the rear elevation. The incongruous appearance of the proposal would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the

host building, and would harm the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the CA, even allowing for its location to the rear.

7. The appellant refers to a number of extensions in the area.
8. However, the extension to 40 Parkholme Road is to the rear of a public house of a different design to the terraces, and it does not therefore set a prevailing context which justifies the appeal proposal.
9. Other extensions referred to are also of a different design and arrangement to the appeal site, including some which appear to have original elements providing accommodation above the ground floor. These examples are also distinctly separate from the appeal site and the associated terraces.
10. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the circumstances of those other extensions are a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, which I have determined on its own merits. In any event, some of the extensions I saw served to confirm the harm that can arise from poorly designed development.
11. Reference is also made to amendments to a previous application on the site which was refused at appeal. However, those amendments have not been successful in addressing the deficiencies of the development for the reasons stated above, even allowing for the subservient nature of the proposal.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Although the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, there are no public or other benefits that would outweigh that harm. I am mindful that the proposal would improve accommodation at the property, but this is essentially a private benefit rather than a public one, and even then the benefit arising from the extra accommodation would be very limited.
13. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (2020) which seek to ensure that development responds to local character and context while also preserving or enhancing the significance of the historic environment. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed and beautiful places as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
14. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2009) and the CA Appraisal in respect of the wider impact of the proposal and the damaging effect to the homogeneity of groups of terraces.

Conclusion

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR