
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/24/3338042

170-172 Stoke Newington Road, London N16 7UY

- 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 Moravicki against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application reference is 2023/1927.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof, enlarging the second-floor flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to erect a mansard style roof level extension across 170 and 172 Stoke Newington Road, which form part of a mainly 3-storey terrace in mixed use. The site is not within a conservation area nor is No 170 or 172 a listed building.
4. The Council has refused planning permission for proposals to enlarge and alter Nos 170-172 with one case that included a roof level extension subsequently dismissed at appeal. To address an issue raised by the previous appeal Inspector, the appellant has provided additional background information in relation to mansard roof additions that have been approved by the Council on 2 other properties in the same terrace as the site. I shall return to these planning decisions later.
5. When seen from Stoke Newington Road, the raised front parapet wall gives a strong horizontal emphasis to the top of Nos 170-172 and that part of the terrace to which they belong. This wall forms a long and largely continuous linear feature that unifies most of the terrace and completes its composition. Despite some external alterations, the upper part of most of the terrace has a high degree of uniformity in design, pattern of fenestration and its roof lines, which is distinctive. As a result, the terrace positively contributes to the character and appearance of the local area.
6. There are existing mansards to 3 properties that form a small group at one end of the same terrace as the site. Consequently, the roofline of the entire terrace has some variety. However, these existing mansards appear to be part of the original design to the host property, and their front windows differ in style and size to those of the proposal. The front parapet wall of these 3 properties is also much lower

than along the rest of the terrace. A raised party wall reinforces this subdivision. Taken together, these features clearly differentiate the properties with existing mansards from those in the rest of the terrace, including Nos 170 and 172. It is the remainder of the terrace that the proposal would be mainly visually 'read'.

7. The set back position of the new addition from the front parapet would ensure that the lower part of the extension would be hidden from public view. However, the upper part of the proposal would project noticeably above the parapet wall of Nos 170-172. In doing so, it would breach one of the key aspects of the appeal properties and most of the terrace, which is the visually strong defining parapet wall. It would create an abrupt visual break in an otherwise largely unbroken roofline to the terrace of which the site forms a part.
8. The proposed mansard extension would not be seen from ground level close to the site. It would, however, be visible from the upper front windows of the buildings on the opposite side of Stoke Newington Road and in more distant views along Beatty Road. From each of these locations, the new addition would be a conspicuous feature given its elevated position even with the use appropriate external materials. It would draw the eye as a visually disruptive element along the unbroken roofline of the terrace. As an obvious later 'add-on', the appeal scheme would detract from the architectural style of the host building. For the same reasons, it would be an unsympathetic and uncharacteristic addition to the townscape and the local area.
9. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD) provides advice in relation to mansard roofs. It notes that the continuity of the parapet line is an important townscape feature of Victorian streets and is often typical of the street scene. The SPD advises that roof extensions are not normally acceptable in those terraces where an unbroken roof line remains. That would be the case with the proposal before me.
10. The appellant places some reliance on the Council's decisions to approve roof level extensions at 158 and 176 Stoke Newington Road, which form part of the same terrace as the site. From the Officer's report provided, the mansard roof extension at No 158 was above the rear 2-storey outrigger of an end terrace property. The approved mansard extension at No 176 would have been next to the short row of existing mansards, thereby forming a larger grouping. The context of both approved schemes would therefore differ to the proposal that would be a standalone feature on the main roof of 2 mid-terrace properties. These earlier planning decisions also predate national and local planning policies. Consequently, I am not convinced that these approved developments are directly comparable with the appeal scheme. While the Council concluded in relation to No 176 that the principle of a mansard roof extension had been established in that instance, the proposal before me is objectionable for the reasons given.
11. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Therefore, it conflicts with Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan, Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 and the Council's SPD. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development achieves the highest standard of design, is compatible with the existing townscape, and responds to local character. The proposal is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

12. The proposal would provide additional accommodation for the upper-level flats that would improve the living conditions for their occupiers. It would also make efficient use of the appeal properties in a location that is accessible, which is encouraged in policy terms. However, these other considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR