
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by R J Marshall LLB DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/16/3166217
40, Claire Place, London E14 8NJ

- 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 Carl Patten against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/16/02345, dated 7 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of a loft space to form an additional bedroom with associated dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies in an attractive high density low rise development. Houses generally lie closely onto the highway, though varied degrees set back from the road result in a pleasingly tight knit but varied urban form.
4. The appeal property is attached to the end of a terrace of 4 houses. It differs from these properties by being set back further from the highway, having its main door facing onto a side footpath rather than the road and having a garden forward of the property surrounded by a tall wall.
5. The proposed dormer would be a substantial structure extending almost the full width of the roof, extending almost to its ridge line and lying not far off the gutter line. As such it would dominate the roof and, even though using matching materials, appear as an incongruous and alien addition to the house. This would be so notwithstanding the visual differences between the house on the appeal site and the terrace to which it is attached as referred to above.
6. The setback of the appeal property from houses in the attached terrace would restrict views of the dormer from the east. However, it would be highly visible in views looking directly onto the house and from the west. The harm caused would thus be apparent over quite a wide area to the detriment of much of the area in the vicinity of the site. The fact that the proposed dormer would not be

visible from the more distant Tiller Road to the north does not make the proposal more acceptable.

7. The appeal property has been designed as a back-to-back house. The appellant says that the adjoining house to the rear, No. 41 Claire Place, has had permission granted for a dormer similar to the one before me. That permission has not yet been implemented. However, the dormer at No. 41 would be on a property tucked away in a less prominent position from the highway. Thus its impact on the character and appearance of the area would not be so great. Nor do I see any benefit, as the appellant alleges, in permitting the proposal before me to ensure that the symmetry between the appeal property and No. 41 is retained. In part this is because in views from the highway the 2 properties are generally not viewed together. There is, moreover, no guarantee that the dormer permitted at No. 41 will be constructed.
8. It is concluded that proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with Policy SP10 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2025 (2010) and Policy DM24 of the Council's Managing Development Document (2013) in so far that they seek to ensure that new development is well integrated into its surroundings and is of the highest quality incorporating principles of good design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

R J Marshall

INSPECTOR