



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/24/3340455

59 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 T. O'Hara and L. Greenwell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2023/2728, dated 27 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of ground floor single storey side/rear extension; loft extension; replacement fenestration and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 3-storey house with a 2-storey outrigger and a ground floor wrap-around extension to the rear. It forms part of a handsome Victorian terrace of houses that notably retain their original butterfly roof forms and, to a large degree, retain the original arrangement to the rear. Consequently, the terrace retains a high degree of uniformity and original features, matters to which I attach significant weight.
4. The proposal would include a roof level addition above the rear part of the property and a sloping roof would be formed above and behind the front parapet. I note this addition would not be visible from Walford Road. However, it would be visible from the properties opposite and to the rear as well as from nearby gardens. Although the V-form of the roof would remain evident at the rear, the space immediately behind this would be infilled with a vertical slate-clad wall that would extend a significant distance above the party walls and existing chimneys in the terrace. In this terrace, with its very regular roof form at the rear, this addition would be an alien and incongruous element leading to clear and significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
5. I note that the planning permission granted in 2009 allowed the installation of glass balustrades at roof level to enable the formation of a roof terrace. This

- approved development is by no means comparable to the appeal proposal which would be far taller and bulkier, and opaque as opposed to translucent.
6. The appeal property includes a single-storey wrap-around extension that was granted planning permission in 2009. The proposed full-width single-storey rear extension would more than double the distance the ground floor would extend beyond the rear wall of the outrigger compared to the existing addition. Whilst I note that the rear wall of this addition would line through with the addition at the rear of 61 Walford Road, the latter is not a full-width extension and is very much an anomaly in this terrace.
 7. In the context of a terrace where the vast majority of the rear ground floor additions extend a modest distance beyond the rear walls of the 2 storey outriggers, the significantly deeper proposed extension would fail to be adequately subservient to the host building and would be an incongruous and anomalous addition to the terrace.
 8. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits I attribute limited weight to the many planning permissions referred to by the appellant, none of which appear to relate to development that is directly comparable to the appeal proposals. In particular, the evidence provided suggests that the recent approval for development at 47 Walford Road relates to a ground floor rear extension that is more akin to the existing extension at the appeal property rather than that now proposed in terms of its rear protrusion beyond the outrigger.
 9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that, due to their size and siting the appeal proposals would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. They therefore fail to accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies LP1 and LP17 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (2020) which, amongst other matters, require extensions to respond to local distinctiveness, respect architectural features, and be sympathetic to local character. There is also clear conflict with the guidance contained within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) (SPD). In respect of single-storey rear extensions the SPD states that the maximum depth normally acceptable is 3m and in respect of roof additions it states that these are not normally acceptable in those terraces where an unbroken roof line remains.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR