



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/24/3343743

1 Belgrade Road, Hackney, London N16 8DH

- 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 Clive Lepper against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2023/2912.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, front and rear roof extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as the proposal relates to the erection of front and rear roof extensions. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the erection of a single storey rear extension at 1 Belgrade Road, Hackney, London N16 8DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/2912, 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 in so far as they relate to the development permitted: 351_PR_01, 351_PR_02, 351_PR_03, 351_PR_04, 351_PR_05, 351_PR_06, 351_PR_07, 351_PR_08, 351_PR_09, 351_PR_10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 3-storey end-of-terrace house that is situated towards one end of Belgrade Road and flanked by a tall block of flats which dominates the street and is clearly at odds with the prevailing scale of development in the rest of Belgrade Road. The house is appreciably taller than its neighbours in the terrace and it includes a prominent gable-fronted dormer at the front. This arrangement provides a bookend to the terrace and mirrors the end of terrace

- house directly opposite, features that contribute to the character and appearance of the street.
4. To the rear the appeal property includes an outrigger with a roof that is contiguous with the main roof and at ground floor level there is a bay window. These features are shared by the neighbouring 3 houses in the terrace giving this group a high level of uniformity. There is further terraced housing close by to the rear. Whilst this is of different design and layout it similarly steps down in height at the back.
 5. The proposal would primarily comprise a roof addition. This would involve the erection of a zinc-clad mansard over the rear part of the roof together with a pair of zinc-clad additions to both sides of the front dormer. The rear roof addition would extend over the outrigger, the brick walls of which would be extended upwards to main eaves level. The pair of front additions would contain narrow windows.
 6. The proposal would result in a significant increase in bulk and massing at roof level which would be incompatible and out of keeping with the roof form of the adjacent part of the terrace. The front additions would detract from the prominence of the gable dormer and would be entirely alien and incongruous elements in the street scene due to their siting, bulk and appearance. For these reasons I conclude that, due to their, siting, size and appearance the roof additions would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.
 7. This aspect of the proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which, amongst other matters, aim to ensure that development is well-designed and responds to local context. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) which states that dormer windows will not normally be acceptable anywhere on the front roof slope of a house.
 8. The appellant has referred to many examples of roof additions and other forms of existing and proposed development in the area. There is nothing before me to indicate that the nearby rear roof dormers in Belgrade Road, Prince George Road and Princess May Road were constructed following the grant of planning permission. In any case, in my view the aerial views provided illustrate the clear harm that can result from such development, as do the examples of front roof additions in the borough. I recognise the need to improve the thermal performance of the property but there is nothing before me to demonstrate that this can only be achieved through the execution of the appeal proposal.
 9. The proposal also includes the erection of a single-storey wraparound rear extension. This would have a flat roof and extend a short distance beyond the main rear wall of the outrigger. I share the Council's view that this aspect of the proposal would appear proportionate in scale to the host property and would not be an incongruous addition. For these reasons the proposed ground floor rear extension accords with the aforementioned policies. As this element is physically and functionally severable from the roof additions a split decision can be issued allowing this part of the proposal.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the erection of the front and rear roof extensions and should succeed in respect of the erection of a single storey rear extension.

S Poole

INSPECTOR