



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3363919

21 Harcombe Road, Hackney, London N16 0RX

- 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 Vanessa Pieterse & Hakan Jonsson against the decision of Hackney Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0117.
 - The development proposed is for an outrigger roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outrigger roof extension at 21 Harcombe Road, Hackney, London N16 0RX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0117, 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 plan: P24-125.1
 - 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 appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a four storey mid-terraced town house with a two-storey mono-pitched outrigger to its rear. The house has undergone a mansard roof extension in the past, the stairwell to which would provide access into the proposed roof extension and would essentially amount to a box dormer type of construction built off the first-floor ceiling of the outrigger.
4. The majority of roofs on outriggers within the immediate terrace retain their original roof slopes, although there are a number of similar such extensions within the rear garden scene created by the terrace of houses to the eastern side of Harcombe Road, of which the appeal site forms part, and those houses found on the western side of Oldfield Road to the east of the appeal site, as well as the wider area.

Therefore, I find that the rear elevations of many houses within the locality are more eclectic than the principal street facing elevations.

5. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) states that all roof alterations and extensions should accord with the general design principles, reflecting the design of the original building and having regard to the character of the area and amenity of neighbours. It goes on to state in paragraph 3.67 that not all houses are capable of extension or conversion at roof level, either because there is insufficient roof space or because the position and design of a roof extension would affect the quality of the local street scene or reduce amenity. The design guidelines provide a number of illustrations as to what form of dormer windows are deemed acceptable on rear roof slopes; however, they tend to focus on principal roofs as opposed to on outriggers.
6. Whilst ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits, I have had regard to the decision of my colleague appertaining to 11 Harcombe Road (Appeal Ref APP/U5360/D/23/3314871), although respectfully, in that case the extension exceeded the height of the eaves of the butterfly roof on that property and was of a greater scale than that proposed before me. The appeal scheme shows that the flat roof of the extension would be just below the parapet wall of the main rear elevation of the host dwelling and furthermore the rear elevation of the extension would be set in from the rear elevation of the outrigger. Consequently, in three dimensional form it would still be possible to read the original design and form of the Victorian architecture on the rear of the host dwelling.
7. I am not in a position to doubt that the even numbered side of Harcombe Road has not retained as much of its uniformity and completeness as for the odd numbered side. However, on balance, due to its location, public views of the proposal would not be apparent, and one would experience the proposed extension against the backdrop of the variety of rear elevations that can be seen within the rear garden scene. I find that the proposal would respond to local character and context and be compatible with the existing townscape pursuant to Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020). I also find that the proposal complies with Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which set out the requirement for Boroughs to undertake area assessments to define the characteristics, qualities and value of different places with the Plan area, to develop an understanding of the different area's capacity for growth; whilst requiring all development to make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including the active encouragement of incremental densification, whilst responding to the existing character of a place and delivering good design.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. The Council has not suggested any conditions be imposed, however for completeness I consider it necessary to impose the standard time limit condition and further conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that materials shall match the existing dwelling.

C J Tivey INSPECTOR