



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on Friday 8 August 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3366655

9 Gloucester Square, Hackney, London, E2 8RS.

- 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 David Gibbons against the decision of Hackney Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0735.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two-storey rear extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to the dwelling at 9 Gloucester Square, Hackney, London, E2 8RS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0735 and plans Refs 3091_051, 3091_101, 3091_102 and 3091_301, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match or complement those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part, as well as its effect on residential amenity at neighbouring properties and at the appeal property itself.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed extension would displace any existing free-standing structure at the rear of the appeal dwelling and permanently occupy a little over half of the small enclosed rear yard. The additional two-storey accommodation would provide a third bedroom and a garden room. This would increase the floorspace of the existing dwelling to some 82sqm, still some way short of the DCLG space recommendations for three-bedroom houses.
4. In my view, with appropriately matching or complementary construction, the extension would sit comfortably beneath the extended and relatively steep rear roof slope so that, overall, I have formed the opinion that it would appear modestly

subordinate to the host dwelling. On that basis, I find that the proposed development would have no harmful impact on the character or appearance of No 9 Gloucester Square itself.

5. It follows that the development would have no significant adverse visual effect on the terrace as whole. That is particularly the case when the proposed extension is viewed against the substantial rear, timber-clad addition no No 8 immediately adjacent to the south. There are other rear projections further along the terrace.
6. The extension would be invisible from the front, within Gloucester Square, and views of it from other properties from the rear would be limited and oblique, including from the north-facing balconies on the neighbouring multistorey residential block.
7. In terms of character and appearance, I find that the proposed development would be compliant with the objectives of Policies LP1 and LP17 of the adopted Hackney Local Plan (HLP) and D3 and D4 of the adopted London Plan as well as the guidance in the Residential and Alterations DPD with respect to achieving housing design of high quality.

Residential Amenity

8. The Council, judging the issue of residential amenity without the benefit of a site visit, consider that the outlook and natural lighting at neighbouring properties would be unacceptably compromised by the proposed extension, in the absence of any technical assessment to prove otherwise. From inspection, I agree with the Appellant that these interests are already substantively harmed, in particular by the visually overwhelming, multistorey block, with its blank wall, save for utilitarian fire escapes, just beyond the back boundary wall of the appeal site.
9. The extension itself would be little seen from the ground floor of the immediately neighbouring dwellings within the terrace and I do not accept that the outlook from the upper rear windows of those dwellings would be much affected in the oblique views available. Certainly, there would be minimal alteration to the outlook from the mainly north-facing balconies of the residential block. Similarly, I do not consider that there would be any undue loss of privacy at the appeal site itself.
10. With natural light already impeded from the east, south and west, even without any quantitative technical assessment, I do not consider that there would be noticeably increased shading from the additional two-storey built projection at the rear of No 8 affecting any neighbouring property.
11. The same would be true of the appeal property itself, where there would still be a small but useable rear yard as well as a quite generous, enclosed front garden facing the open and private Gloucester Square.
12. I accordingly find that the proposed development would be compliant with the aims of the relevant Policies LP2 and of the HLP, D6 of the London Plan and the Extensions and Alterations DPD with regard to protecting residential amenity.

- continued -

Conclusion

13. The policies cited above are essentially consistent with national policy and I find that, for the reasons I have stated, the appeal proposal is compliant with the development plan as a whole.
14. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed and the permission sought granted, subject only to standard conditions.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR