



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/24/3354627

15 Rookwood Road, Hackney, London N16 6SP

- 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 Lez Silver against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0730.
 - The development proposed is described as: Front dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. During the course of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 was revised. There are no substantive changes relevant to the main issue in the appeal before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a terrace comprising two-storey dwellings of a similar scale and design, creating an attractive homogeneity to the built environment and positively contributing to the character and appearance of the area. The linear rows of unaltered front roof slopes, including that of the appeal property, form a strong design feature of the area. The few front dormers around the appeal site disrupt the symmetry of the wider terrace, particularly the unaltered front roof slopes, detracting from the area's distinctive character.
5. The proposed dormer would extend along the majority of the front roof slope of the appeal property, projecting notably above the ridge line of the pitched roof bay, appearing prominent within the street scene. This prominence would visually detract from the continuity of the front roof slopes, interrupting the uniformity in design of the dwellings forming the terrace. The proposal would unbalance the symmetry of the existing terrace, disrupting the rhythm of the built environment, harming the character and appearance of the area.
6. The Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations (2009) (SPD) states that dormer windows will not normally be acceptable anywhere on the front roof slope of a house. One

exception is where a large number of front roof extensions have been constructed. Whilst there are front dormers within streets in the wider area, their distance from the appeal property means that they are not seen within the same context as the appeal site. Further, I do not know the circumstances under which they were constructed or their status with regard to planning permission and therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. Given the scarcity of front dormers within the vicinity of the appeal site, these do not form part of the established character of the area.

7. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in this regard, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D4 of The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021), and Policies LP1 and LP17 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (2020). When read together these require new development to respond to local character and context. The proposal would additionally conflict with the relevant provisions of the SPD which requires roof extensions and alterations to be designed to complement the host dwelling and existing streetscape.

Conclusion

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

N Unwin

INSPECTOR