



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3366806

108 Rushmore Road, Hackney, London, E5 0EX

- 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 Gemma Booth against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0559.
 - The development proposed is erection of mansard roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of mansard roof extension at 108 Rushmore Road, Hackney, London, E5 0EX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0559, 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 approved plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250 and Drg Nos PP-01, PP-02, PP-03, PP-04, PP-05, PP-06, PP-07, PP-08, PP-09, PP-10, PP-11, PP-12, PP-13 and PP-14.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey with basement, mid-terraced dwelling. Consistent with other properties along the terrace and most others in the surrounding residential streets, it has a traditional London (butterfly) roof with two pitches aligned front to rear sloping into a central valley and concealed behind a front parapet. The proposal is to add a mansard-style roof extension with dormers to the rear to create additional living accommodation within the existing loft area.
4. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD), adopted in 2009, deals with mansard roofs at part E. It describes the roof form of the older type of Victorian terrace, as typically seen along Rushmore Road and its surroundings, and highlights the importance of a continuous parapet line as a townscape feature within these early/mid Victorian streets. It is for this reason the SPD states that roof extensions are not normally

acceptable in those terraces where an unbroken roof line remains. However, it goes on to state that where the introduction of a roof extension would be acceptable, a mansard roof should normally be used.

5. None of the dwellings within the terraced group of which No 108 forms part have a roof extension. As such, the roofline of the terrace is unbroken. However, the appellant has drawn my attention to several mansard style roof extensions within the immediate area, including elsewhere along Rushmore Road, some of which I observed for myself where the backs of some properties are open to view from the public domain. Such roof changes are clearly prevalent within the locality and part of the area's evolution. Their acceptability within the area, including on some terraces with an unbroken roof line, is illustrated further by the appellant with several extracts from officers' reports, and two specific appeal decisions, which all concluded that such changes would not appear out of character.
6. In this instance the mansard would sit behind the dwelling's front parapet which would be unbroken, ensuring the retention of a continuous parapet line along the terrace, in accord with the SPD's guidance and objectives. The shallow pitch of the front roof slope would ensure the roof addition would be largely out of sight from street level such that overall, I am satisfied the uniform character of the terrace would be preserved. Where the mansard may be glimpsed from views further afield, it would simply be reflective of other similar roof extensions within the area, and how its roofscape has evolved.
7. To the rear, the butterfly profile of the existing roof would be preserved, with the mansard itself seen within a rear garden setting, and in only limited views from surrounding properties, as an appropriate form of extension that is supported, in principle, by the SPD.
8. Overall, having regard to the specific detail of the proposal, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of No 108 or the wider area. As such, by responding positively to its local context, the proposal would display the quality of design required by Policies LP1 and LP17 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033, adopted in 2020, and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan 2021.

Conditions

9. The Council's appeal questionnaire does not suggest any conditions to be imposed in the event of the appeal succeeding. Nevertheless, in addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR