



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by **P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

**Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3368453**

**31 Lampard Grove, Hackney, London N16 6XA**

- 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 Mrs Honig against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
- The application Ref is 2025/0656.
- The development proposed is a ground and first-floor rear extension.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground and first-floor rear extension at 31 Lampard Grove, Hackney, London N16 6XA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0656, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:  
Location and Block Plan – E00  
Proposed Drawings Floor Plans – P01  
Proposed Drawings Elevations – P02  
Proposed Drawings Elevations – P03  
Proposed Drawings Section – P04
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Applications for Costs

2. Applications for costs have been made by the appellant against the Council, and by the Council against the appellant. These applications are the subject of separate decisions.

### Preliminary Matters

3. Following a review of all available evidence, the Council was asked to clarify the plans used to determine the application. It was confirmed that the plans initially submitted related to a previously approved scheme at the property and were therefore incorrect. The correct plans have since been provided, and both parties

agree that they represent the scheme subject to the appeal. This decision has been made based on those plans.

4. The Council's officer report and decision notice both refer to the Emerging Stamford Hill Area Action Plan (AAP). However, copies of that document have not been submitted as part of the appeal, nor has confirmation been provided regarding its current stage of preparation. Accordingly, no weight has been afforded to the emerging AAP in this decision. The appeal has therefore been determined against the adopted policies and guidance that have been provided, comprising the London Plan, March 2021 (the LP), the Hackney Local Plan 2033, Strategic Planning, Adopted July 2020 (the HLP), and the Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions and Alterations, Approved April 2009 (the SPD).

### **Main Issue**

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

### **Reasons**

6. The appeal property is an end-terrace dwelling within a uniform row of mid-20th century two-storey houses. These properties are characterised by their simple, rectilinear form and shallow-pitched roofs, which from street level appear almost flat. This consistent architectural rhythm contributes to the overall character of the terrace.
7. To the rear, the properties face onto an area that serves as a publicly accessible pedestrian thoroughfare between Lampard Grove and Lynmouth Road. This space also functions as a privately accessible parking and servicing area for properties on both streets, with a lockable gate restricting vehicular access but allowing unrestricted pedestrian movement. Consequently, the rear elevations of the terrace are readily visible from public vantage points.
8. The Council's concerns regarding the dominance and visual intrusion of the proposal primarily relate to the absence of other two-storey rear extensions within the terrace and the uniform first-floor building line this currently provides. However, the adopted SPD does not prohibit two-storey rear extensions outright in such circumstances. Conversely, it acknowledges that such extensions may be acceptable for end-of-terrace properties where they are appropriately scaled and designed, provided they do not appear over-dominant and comply with amenity safeguards such as the 45-degree rule.
9. In this case, the proposal would project 3 metres at both ground and first floor levels, aligning with the SPD's guidance on depth for terraced houses. The first-floor element would be inset from the boundary with the adjoining property and its nearest windows, reducing its visual bulk compared to a full-width projection and ensuring compliance with the 45-degree rule. Although the extension would have a flat roof, the terrace's shallow-pitched roofs appear almost flat from street level, meaning the roof form would not jar with the prevailing character. Whilst the terrace currently lacks two-storey rear extensions, the SPD anticipates such proposals to be acceptable in appropriate circumstances, and I am satisfied that the proposed scheme falls within that scope.

10. Paragraph 3.13 of the SPD states that rear extensions should be at least one storey lower than the eaves height of the host building. Whilst I note the Council's reference to this guidance, SPD paragraph 3.31 and the accompanying diagrams indicate that two-storey rear extensions to two-storey properties may be acceptable in certain circumstances. This creates some ambiguity regarding how the SPD defines the relationship between the eaves of the host property and the height of any extension. However, considering the SPD as a whole, and given the design measures incorporated in this proposal, I am not persuaded of any specific conflict with its provisions.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would represent an appropriately scaled and subordinate addition to the host property. Although it would introduce a new extension typology within the terrace, it would not appear over-dominant or visually intrusive and would respect the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policy D3 of the LP, Policy LP1 of the HLP, and the provisions of the SPD, which collectively seek to ensure that extensions remain subordinate and respect the original form and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed in my formal decision.

*P Storey*

INSPECTOR