The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/17/3168548
3 Isambard Mews, London E14 3XB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Colin Chau against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
- The application Ref PA/16/03036, dated 17 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2017.
- The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extension at 3 Isambard Mews, London E14 3XB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/16/03036, dated 17 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan of E14 3XB, Site Plan/Block Plan of E14 3XB, 3466/001/E, 3466/002/E, 3466/003/E, 3466/004/E, 3466/005/E, 3466/006/E.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary matters

2. In December 2015 the Council granted planning permission[1] for a "Single storey, ground floor, side and rear extension to existing two-storey, semi-detached dwelling house". This permits a similar extension to that proposed under the appeal proposal, but instead of being at ground level is set a short distance into the ground so that the actual height of the permitted development would be lower than when compared to the current proposal.

3. Building works had commenced at the time of the site visit and had involved removing some walling and windows from the existing building. These works would be as required under the 2015 permission as much as under the appeal proposal.

[1] Council reference: PA/15/03179

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located off a short cul-de-sac, which is located itself off a looped road from the A1206 round the Isle of Dogs. The properties in the immediate area are distinctive being two storeys with pyramidal roofs, some with cupolas on top. This means that the area has a cohesive appearance. Isambard Mews consists of four pairs of similarly designed semi-detached houses, although building works are taking place at No 5 where a two storey side and rear extension is nearing completion.

6. The proposal is for a single storey side and rear flat roof extension which would 'wrap round' the property, although the side extension would be set back from front elevation to approximately half the depth of the existing house. Unlike the previous permission, which had a sedum roof, the proposal would have a conventional hard surfaced roof and two low pitched roof lights which would be located above the side and rear extensions.

7. Although the proposal would extend further up the height of the building than the permitted scheme it would still remain as a sub-ordinate extension to the main dwelling. It would be located below the existing brick soldier course which runs around the building at a level below the sills of the first floor windows and, subject to appropriate materials, would integrate with the existing building rather than dominating it.

8. In coming into Isambard Mews the proposal would be located behind the existing garage for No 3 and this would minimise the effect on the street scene, so that it would not be intrusive, particularly as the proposal would be set back from the carriageway itself, and would not detract from the cohesive appearance of or openness in the area.

9. As such the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy SP10 of the Tower Hamlets Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2025 and Policy DM24 of the Tower Hamlets Local Development Framework Managing Development Document which seek to ensure development is of the highest quality and takes account of the character, scale and bulk of the surrounding built form. It would also comply with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which indicates that development should aim to respond to local character, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

11. I have also imposed a condition requiring materials to match the existing building to ensure that the proposal integrates with both the existing building and the character and appearance of the area.

12. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R J Jackson

INSPECTOR