



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3369570

10 Meynell Road, Hackney, London, E9 7AP

- 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 Francis MacG Grier and Mr Frederick Woolfe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2410.
 - The development proposed is alteration, adaption and extension to the existing loft floor by inserting a roof light to the front slope and dormer to the rear with roof lights on the flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the alteration, adaption and extension to the existing loft floor by inserting a dormer to the rear with roof lights on the flat roof.
2. The appeal succeeds insofar as it relates to inserting a roof light to the front slope and planning permission is granted for inserting a roof light to the front slope at 10 Meynell Road, Hackney, London, E9 7AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/2410, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council stated that it had no objection to the proposed roof light to the front slope and this is taken into account in the decision above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Victoria Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a double-fronted terraced house set back from the street behind a low brick wall and a short, paved garden area. It is located in a prominent position towards a corner of Meynell Road, such that both its front and rear elevations are visible from Meynell Road. It has a small garden to the rear, which

backs on to the side elevation and rear garden of a dwelling around the corner of Meynell Road.

6. The appeal property is located in a residential area, largely characterised by the presence of terraced dwellings set back from the road behind low walls and short garden areas and with gardens to the rear. The appeal dwelling faces towards a large area of public parkland.
7. The appeal property is located within the Victoria Park Conservation Area, characterised by the presence of well-preserved Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian period properties, some comprising grand villas, some set within terraces, together with occasional modern dwellings of architectural interest. Further, the presence of gardens and street trees, the setting-back of dwellings from the street and the adjacent public parkland all combine to provide for a green and spacious local character.
8. The appeal dwelling is a locally listed building and it sits within a terrace notable for its double-fronted dwellings constructed in yellow brick with white detailing, Ionic-columned porches, eaves corncicing and bay windows at ground-floor level.
9. During my site visit, I observed that both the front and rear elevations of the appeal dwelling and other dwellings within the same terrace, are notable for their attractive period features, including their pitched slate roofs, brick chimneys, sash windows and largely original form, all of which combine to make a positive contribution to the significance of the Victoria Park Conservation Area.
10. I also noted during my site visit that, in the most prominent views from Meynell Street to the pitched roofs to the rear of the terrace in which the appeal dwelling is located, the roofline does not appear to be significantly disrupted by the presence of dormers. Whilst there are rear dormers elsewhere on Meynell Street, these are located considerably further away from the corner close to where the appeal dwelling is located and do not appear prominently in public views from Meynell Street. In contrast, the rear roof slope of the appeal dwelling, like those of immediately neighbouring dwellings, does appear prominently in open views from Meynell Street.
11. The proposed roof extension would comprise a dormer that would extend across the majority of the width of the dwelling. It would be set only slightly down from ridge height and this and the overall scale and design of the proposal would result in the proposed development appearing very large and bulky.
12. The bulk, scale and boxy appearance of the proposed dormer would appear in severe contrast to the traditional pitched roof of the appeal dwelling, as well as those of its immediate neighbours. In this regard, I agree with the Council's consideration that this would result in the dormer appearing as an obtrusive addition that would disrupt a locally listed terrace's elegant, traditional roofline.
13. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal drawing attention to itself as an unduly dominant feature within its surroundings, due to its prominent location, high up on a widely visible roof slope.
14. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would detract from and would not conserve the appearance of the Victoria Park Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to

Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Victoria Park Conservation Area would be less than substantial.

15. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring. Whilst I note that the proposal would result in full thermal insulation throughout the roof, provide additional space and form part of wider conservation works, these do not amount to public benefits that outweigh the harm identified.
16. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the Victoria Park Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policies D1, D3, D4 and HC1; and to Hackney Local Plan (2020) Policies LP1 and LP3, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

17. In support of the proposal, the appellants draw attention to an existing dormer at Number 7 Meynell Road. As noted above, this dormer is largely hidden in views from Meynell Road, whereas the appeal dwelling's rear roof slope is not. Also in this regard, I am mindful of the Council's comment that the dormer at No 7 replaced a pre-existing poor-quality dormer.
18. Taking these factors into account, the dormer at No 7 does not present a precedent for the development proposed. Furthermore, the presence of the dormer at No 7 does not reduce or mitigate the identified harm that would arise as a result of the proposal the subject of this appeal.
19. In addition to the above and also in support of their case, the appellants draw attention to other large rear dormers within the Victoria Park Conservation Area. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the circumstances relating to each of these are so similar to those relating to the proposal the subject of this appeal as to provide for direct comparison. In any case, I have found that the proposed development would result in harm and this is not something that is reduced or mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
20. The appellants state that no negative comments were received during public consultation. However, the absence of objections could be for any number of reasons and it does not amount to support for the proposed development.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed insofar as it relates to a rear dormer, but succeeds insofar as it relates to a roof light to the front slope.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR