



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2025 by A Conteh

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3359664

214 Pitfield Street, Hackney, London N1 5JB

- 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. Altia Ruth Noel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0975.
 - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension and erection of an additional storey to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey rear extension and erection of an additional storey to match existing at 214 Pitfield Street, Hackney, London, N1 5JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/0975, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 073_210_C, 073_211_C, 073_212_C, 073_213_C, 073_214_C, 073_251_C, 073_252_C, 073_253_C, 073_254_C, 073_255_C, 073_256_C, and 073_271_C.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal development constitutes one half of a pair of dwellings within a short terrace. The dwellings which comprise the terrace have staggered, irregular roof heights with similar pitch and exhibit varied architectural details across their consistent brick-style exterior. In the wider streetscape, many buildings are substantially taller than the appeal site and terrace.
5. The proposed single-storey rear extension would add depth causing the appeal property to project further backward than the existing rear building line. Visibility of

the rear of the terrace and the appeal site is limited by vegetation and the sequential layout of dwellings. This would mean the visual impact of this part of the proposal would be limited. Furthermore, the scale of the rear extension would make it a subservient addition to the appeal property. Therefore, the proposed single-storey rear extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposed additional storey would raise the roof height of the appeal dwelling, however it would be no higher than the ridge of the taller building at the other end of the terrace. Within the context of the area, where a considerable number of buildings of greater height can be seen both in the terrace and street scene, the proposed roof extension would not be an unsympathetic addition to the scale, form and massing of development in the area.
7. The fluctuations in height within the terrace create spaces which break up the visual mass of this part of the streetscape. However, as the appeal dwelling is located toward the end of the terrace, buildings of lower height would remain in the middle, and the additional mass created at the end of the terrace would be of similar scale to the building adjacent. Therefore, the proposal would not result in significant disruption of the existing urban grain, as the varied rhythm of the roofscape would remain.
8. The proposed third storey would result in different heights between the appeal dwelling and its pair, No 216. However, there is no significant symmetry across the terrace as a whole, and the symmetry of the pairs within the wider terrace does not therefore make a significant contribution to the streetscene. The proposal to match existing materials would mean the development would fit into the varied yet cohesive architectural style of the terrace, where dwellings demonstrate a mix of window types, detailing and boundary treatments while upholding a consistent external material and colour. This integration would minimise any visual impact of symmetry lost between the appeal site and its immediate dwelling pair, overall preserving most original architectural features and the surrounding local vernacular. Consequently, with regard to scale and design, the proposed additional storey would not appear obtrusive or incompatible with surrounding development and would not harm the character and appearance of the terrace.
9. The visibility of the appeal site from the public realm, namely Shoreditch Park and Ivy Street, is greatly limited due to the presence of trees and vegetation which provide screening to the front and rear elevations. Notwithstanding, the proposal would see the appeal site share a similar height with immediately neighbouring dwellings and as such, appear congruous within its surroundings when viewed from the public realm. The restrictions on motor vehicles and presence of green, open space opposite the appeal site give the area a spacious character. As the proposal does not directly affect these factors, and in the context of much taller buildings around the site, it would not cause the area to feel cramped.
10. The proposal incorporates rear rooflights, which are not found elsewhere on this terrace. Their proximity to the ridge of the roof, however, would mean limited visibility from the public realm, and as such they would not be harmful.
11. As a result, overall, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it aligns with Policies LP1 and LP17 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (adopted 2020) and Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 which require high quality housing design that responds to local character.

12. The proposal would also accord with the aims of the Hackney Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2009 insofar as it requires residential extensions and alterations to have regard to the character of the area and in relation to the specific guidance on rear extensions.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge the concerns raised that the proposed scheme appears to be similar in scale and mass to previously refused schemes and in conflict with pre-application advice, however, having considered the merits of this proposal, I am satisfied that the most recent scheme is acceptable for the reasons above. The previous schemes are not before me to consider in this appeal.
14. The appeal property is sited within a part of Pitfield Street which is closed to vehicles, allowing for pedestrian and cycle access only. I also observed signage indicating similar restrictions along Ivy St. While there are vehicle and parking constraints, the proposed development would retain the single off-street parking space at the appeal site. Furthermore, the proposal seeks to increase the size of bedrooms, not the quantity. Therefore, it would not increase the requirement for parking, and there is no substantive evidence before me that it would exacerbate existing parking problems in the area.
15. It is not within my remit in dealing with this appeal to comment on or determine the financial interests of parties or whether the scheme will benefit long-term residents.
16. The appeal does not propose the use of the roof of the rear extension for amenity purposes and in any case would likely require further planning permission to erect railings and similar pertinent safety structures. Therefore, the Council's suggested condition to prevent use of the flat roof as a terrace or balcony is not necessary.
17. During my visit, I observed the staggered projection of dwellings at the rear of the terrace. This would reduce the likelihood of overlooking from the proposal as rear gardens start at different points. Furthermore, rear gardens are already overlooked from windows at various heights. As a result, the additional windows proposed in this proposal are not likely to result in a harmful reduction in the privacy of existing residents.
18. Objections regarding disturbance during construction are noted, and I appreciate that many people now work from home and would find daytime building work disruptive. However, any impact would be temporary and an unavoidable effect of development. Consequently, it would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbours and does not justify refusal of the scheme.

Conditions

19. In addition to the standard time limit on commencement, a condition is necessary to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty.
20. Use of matching materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, however as the approved plans state that materials will match, a separate materials condition is not needed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

21. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

A Conteh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

22. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR