
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/W/17/3174036

27A Lockhart Street, London E3 4BL

- 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 Mrs Jasmine Murphy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/16/03292, dated 24 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single-storey side extension to the ground floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension to the ground floor flat at 27A Lockhart Street, London E3 4BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/16/03292, dated 24 August 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: Drawing Nos SPP-05; SPP-06; SPP-07.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development upon:
 - The living conditions of existing and future occupiers; and
 - The character and appearance of the Ropery Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terraced property divided into flats within a residential area, part of the Ropery CA. The rear of the property has a small

outdoor courtyard area and the property has a newer rear single-storey element forming the kitchen. The extension would extend to the side boundary with No 29 to allow for the enlargement of the kitchen/dining area. The development would be single-storey with a mono-pitched roof.

4. Whilst the extension would reduce the area of outdoor amenity space available for the occupiers of the property, this is very limited in size at present. As such, the loss of part of the outdoor space would not be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the existing dwelling. The extension would allow for an increase in the size of the kitchen and the benefits that this would bring to the occupants of the dwelling would outweigh any harm from the reduction in outdoor space, given its current limited size. As such, the proposal complies with Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy DM25 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan which seek to ensure that development protects amenity and well-being of existing and future residents.

Character and Appearance

5. The Ropery Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Guidelines document states that this area is defined by its uniform group of terraces. With the exception of the builders' merchants to the north of the appeal site, the street scene is uniform in appearance which results in a strong character and an attractive appearance to the Ropery CA. The rear of the properties are relatively uniform in terms of their rear projections however I note that some nearby properties on Ropery Street have had rear extensions under the benefit of permitted development.
6. The proposed extension would be largely screened, with views limited to those from the adjoining and existing properties. The site is not readily visible from the cemetery to the rear due to the existing concrete and brick boundary wall and existing vegetation. The scale of the development is small and would not result in an incongruous or excessive addition to the existing property. The design reflects the existing dwelling and the materials can be conditioned to secure a satisfactory match.
7. Given the above considerations, an extension of this scale and in this location would not result in significant harm to the existing dwelling or the visual and historic character of the Ropery CA, whose character and appearance would thereby be preserved. As such, the development accords with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan March 2016, Policies SP10 and SP12 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy DM24 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan, all of which seek to ensure that development reflects the local character and distinctiveness and the historic environment. Furthermore, the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches great importance to good design and the need to preserve the positive contribution of Conservation Areas.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans in the interest of clarity. A condition for samples of

the materials is also necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the Ropery CA. However, I have amended the wording suggested by the Council for clarity.

R Norman

INSPECTOR