



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/24/3355734

Flat 3, 43 Englefield Road, Hackney, London N1 4HJ

- 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 Ms Claire Davis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1538.
 - The development proposed is loft mansard dormer, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Various addresses have been given for the appeal site. I have taken the address in the heading above from the planning application form as this reflects that on the Council's decision notice and the consultation details of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, with due regard to the De Beauvoir Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the end of a short terrace of properties of a substantial and attractive traditional design. It is linked at ground floor level to a second terrace of basically the same scale and design. The character of these terraces derives from their strong, uniform design, including the rhythm of doors and windows as well as the unbroken line of butterfly roofs set behind a front parapet.
5. The appeal site is located within the De Beauvoir Conservation Area (CA). This is one of the area's most important early Victorian planned estates, and the relatively unaltered design and quality of buildings, such as the appeal site and the associated terraces, contributes to the architectural integrity and importance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
6. The proposal includes a mansard extension to the roof. The front and rear elevations of the mansard would be set back from the main elevations of the dwelling and would retain some elements of the butterfly roof. The appellant also contends that the set back from the front elevation and the low height of the

mansard would mean that the roofscape of the terrace would remain unbroken in views from Englefield Road.

7. However, the mansard roof would be visible as a clumsy addition to the building in angled views along Englefield Road, particularly in views of the end of the terrace. The rear of the mansard would also be prominent in views from Ufton Road and Culford Road, which enable views of the rear of the terrace from the public realm. The retention of elements of the butterfly roof would do little to mitigate the harm arising from the intrusion of the proposal into the otherwise unbroken form of the terrace roofs.
8. The proposal also includes a Juliet balcony on the rear elevation of the building. This would disrupt the regular form and arrangement of windows on the rear of the terrace. Despite the understated appearance of the rear elevation, the Juliet balcony would be a jarring feature which would detract from the traditional design and rhythm of the rear of the terrace.
9. The appellant refers to other properties in the area where roof extensions have been permitted, including on Culford Road and Englefield Road. However, it has not been demonstrated that those other properties are of a similar arrangement as the appeal site, in particular with regards to its prominence at the end of a terrace and views of the rear elevation. That is the case even allowing for the potentially greater setback of the appeal proposal from the front elevation.
10. Due to its design and prominent location, the appeal proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building. The proposal would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, I attach great weight to the conservation of this designated heritage asset. There are no public or other benefits that would outweigh the identified harm to this heritage asset.
11. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design and heritage requirements of Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2020. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2009 with regards to the introduction of mansard roofs on terraces within an unbroken roof line.

Other Matters

12. The Council's delegated report refers to concerns in relation to loss of light, outlook and privacy in respect of neighbouring properties. However, this is not referred to in the Council's decision notice. Had I been minded to allow this appeal then I would have considered this matter further.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR