
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/25/3370774

47 Burma Road, Hackney, London N16 9BH

- 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 Tauheed Naz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0698.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension and creation of a mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Varying references have been made to the current lawful use of the site, including as two separate flats. From the evidence before me, including the type of application which is for a householder application for works or an extension to a dwelling, I consider the lawful use to be as a single-family dwelling and have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building, the area, and the neighbouring locally listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises of a four-storey end terrace building. Its ground floor is in an elevated position with the terrace having a generally consistent front elevation, which includes projecting front bay windows and other architectural detailing. This provides for a traditional, coherent character to the area.
5. The neighbouring property at No. 42 Clissold Crescent, a locally listed building, is a detached house which derives its significance from its historical connection with the Architect James Brooks who designed a number of churches in the Gothic Revival style, and also its architectural interest from its pointed arches surrounding the windows which are set in red brick walls.
6. The proposed extension and alterations to the rear of the property would incorporate large areas of glazing, with one such area extending from the lower ground floor to the first-floor level. The extent of glazing would not reflect the traditional form of the terrace, where the walls consist of a high solid to void ratio.

7. The rear extension and alterations proposed would not affect the primary façade of the terrace that the appeal site forms part of or that of the neighbouring property at No. 42. It would also not be directly attached to this neighbouring locally listed building. However, the large glazed areas proposed would not be sympathetic to or create a harmonious relationship with the smaller window openings on the neighbouring properties to either side, many of which feature decorative surrounding detail, and which are set within notable areas of walling. Although the extension is shielded in some views from Clissold Crescent by intervening built form and vegetation, it would nevertheless be seen from various public vantage points to the rear of the site.
8. The footprint and the scale of the rear extension would result in its size having a subservient relationship with the host property. The proposal would also utilise matching brickwork. The Council has raised no concerns on these aspects of the proposal or the mansard roof extension or roof terraces proposed, and given their size and design, I have no reason to disagree.
9. Nevertheless, I conclude that the development overall would have an unacceptable harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host building, the area and adversely impact the setting of the neighbouring locally listed building. As such, it would conflict with Policies LP1, LP4 and LP17 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (Local Plan) and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, development that responds to local character and conserves the significance of non-designated heritage assets and their settings. Although the Local Plan supports innovative contemporary design, this is on the proviso that it respects and complements historic character, which this proposal would fail to do.
10. It would also be contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. The neighbouring locally listed building is a non-designated heritage asset, but the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) at Paragraph 216 is clear that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account. The proposal would be contrary to the Framework in this regard, which seeks to avoid harm to the significance of non-designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. The proposal, with enlarged and reconfigured space would provide for modern family living with the development incorporating sustainable measures. Reference has been made to enhancing existing housing stock and to making optimised use of the site. The appeal property has however had previous permissions granted, which included for various extensions which would have resulted in larger, reconfigured accommodation. I therefore attach limited weight to these benefits which could be realised without the harm identified in this appeal.
12. The proposal would not give rise to any adverse impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would provide an acceptable internal environment for future occupiers as well as sufficient outdoor amenity space. The site is easily accessed by public transport, with shops and services being located nearby. The development would be acceptable in terms of fire and highway safety and would also not harm strategic or identified local views. These are however neutral considerations and are not matters which weigh in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR