

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3367164

30 Heathland Road, Hackney, London N16 5NH

- 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 Nafthali Reichman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0056.
 - The development proposed is erection of a front roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development provided in the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description of development provided in the appeal form as it accurately reflects the proposal before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property. It is located within a quiet, residential area, characterised predominantly by late Victorian terraced and semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs, many of which feature double-storey bay windows. Dwellings are spaced close together, creating a terracing effect between semi-detached dwellings and maintaining a cohesive roof line along the street scene. The dwellings have a consistent architectural language, with modest proportions and traditional detailing that reflect the historic character of the area and give the street scene a pleasant rhythm. While a few dwellings have undergone roof alterations, these additions are not representative of the prevailing pattern of development.
6. The proposed dormer would span the full width of the dwelling, occupying the majority of the front roof slope, appearing dominant and visually obtrusive. The proposed roof extension would introduce a box-like built form, resulting in

excessive bulk and massing which would disrupt the traditional roof form of the appeal dwelling and unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties. Despite the use of matching materials, the scale, massing and siting of the extension would fail to appear subservient and respect the architectural hierarchy of the property. The design would not integrate with the prevailing roof profile, resulting in a discordant addition that would undermine the modest, coherent and uniform character of the frontage.

7. Although similar roof extensions exist within the site's immediate surroundings, limited information has been presented regarding these particular schemes and I cannot be certain of the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. These front additions remain relatively sparse, and do not reflect the established pattern of development which characterises this area. These examples are out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene and do not provide justification for the proposed development. Due to these factors, the existing roof extensions cannot be considered an endorsement of additional intrusive alterations and for the reasons given above, I attribute very limited weight to them.
8. There are examples of more recent blocks of flats in the area, but they represent a different architectural style and form, which is not comparable to the prevailing Victorian character of the street scene. Consequently, these buildings are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme before me and I have therefore ascribed very limited weight to this consideration.
9. The reliance on incremental change and architectural variation overlooks the importance of protecting the largely uniform appearance of the street scene. The suggestion that the development represents effective use of land under paragraph 125e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) is noted, but it does not outweigh the visual harm which the proposed development would cause in this case.
10. I have had regard to the objectives of the Framework cited by the appellant, such as the economic benefits associated with the proposal. It is also argued that the proposal would provide additional accommodation for existing and future occupiers of the property, creating comfortable, usable and accessible space. However, these considerations would be outweighed by the enduring impact that the development would have on the built environment. The lack of harm in other aspects, including ecology, are neutral matters that weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
11. The appellant states that they would accept relevant conditions which would make the proposal acceptable. However, none of the suggested conditions, including the use of matching materials, would appropriately mitigate the harm resulting from the proposed development.
12. Consequently, the proposed front roof extension, owing to its excessive bulk, scale, massing and inappropriate siting, would constitute a visually obtrusive and incongruous addition which would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. The proposal would therefore conflict with the design aims of Policy D3 of The London Plan [March 2021] (TLP) and Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 [Adopted July 2020]. These notably require development proposals to be of high architectural and urban design quality, by enhancing local context and responding positively to local

distinctiveness. I however find no conflict with TLP Policy D1, which focuses on the capacity for growth and is thus of limited relevance to this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR