
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2017

by A Jordan BA Hons MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/W/17/3181959

16a Turners Road, Tower Hamlets, London, E3 4LE

- 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 Alex Bradshaw against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/17/01405, dated 12 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of an additional room and w/c in the loft space at the rear of the property. Sedum roof to the front of the property with maintenance access from the proposed loft room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property sits with a short terrace of Victorian dwellings. Turners Road is predominantly residential in character and both the street and the surrounding area have a wide range of dwelling types from differing periods which provides an eclectic street scene. From Turners Road, the terrace is distinct as a composed group and despite varied alteration to both the front and rear, the front parapet and valley roofs to the rear form strong unifying visual elements. These elements are also evident on properties in the adjoining Brickfield Gardens Conservation Area and whilst the Council does not consider that the terrace is a heritage asset, I concur with their view that its attractive traditional appearance makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.
4. The appeal relates to the erection of a roof extension, which would sit back from the parapet, within the valley roof. It would have a pitched roof, the apex of which would reach to around the height of the existing chimney stacks. It would be part constructed in brick to match the party wall and clad in galvanised steel with solar panels on the south facing pitch. A sedum roof would be installed to the flat roofed section in front of the extension.
5. The extension would be a large addition to the roof and its angular contemporary form and materials would represent a significant departure from

the traditional appearance of the host dwelling. It would not be evident from street level along Turner Road, as it would be set back behind the parapet and the top of the front façade would be angled back. Nevertheless, it would be clearly seen within facing properties, and views of the rear of the property would also be available from within properties on Clemence Street and from the gap in the frontage provided by the parking area along that road.

6. I have considered whether, given the diverse architectural palette in evidence in and around the site, the contrast in appearance between the extension and the host dwelling would harm the character or appearance of the area. I recognise that the roof form is an inversion of the valley roof to the rear, but this reference is not evident in available views from the front, where the projecting apex and galvanised steel cladding would appear as a strident and overly prominent feature, which would be fundamentally incompatible with the restrained proportions of the terrace below. To the rear, even within the less formal composition provided by the rear extensions, due to the scale of the extension and the height of the projecting apex, the extension would appear overly dominant and so would fail to be comfortably assimilated into the existing urban fabric.
7. In coming to a view I have taken into account the relatively limited visibility of the proposal and the varied context in which it would sit. I also bear in mind that the reflective qualities of the galvanised steel would become tempered over time, reducing its prominence. Nevertheless, the scale and appearance of the extension would not relate well to the host dwelling, and as a result the proposal would form a discordant and incongruous feature which would fail to enhance local character.
8. Of those policies put forward by the Council I consider policy DM24 of the *Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Development Plan Document* to be most relevant. The proposal would conflict with the requirement to provide development that is sensitive to and enhances local character, taking into account the surrounding scale, height, mass bulk and form of development. It would also fail to comply with guidance in the framework, which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of an area.
9. The proposal would provide additional family accommodation for the appellant and would bring some small scale environmental benefits through the generation of renewable energy and the provision of additional habitat and sustainable drainage via the sedum roof. I also note that the application has the support of the adjoining neighbour. However, these benefits would be insufficient to outweigh the harm identified above. I also note that the appellant has expressed concerns in relation to how the application was dealt with by the local authority. However, this matter would not alter the merits of the scheme before me.
10. Therefore, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR