



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/19/3235907

31 Senrab Street, Tower Hamlets, London E1 0QE

- 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 Nigel Oh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/19/00794, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2019.
 - The proposed development is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Nigel Oh against the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and the Albert Gardens Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, end-of-terrace property situated on the corner of Senrab Street and Antill Terrace. The site lies within the Albert Gardens Conservation Area, whose significance is largely derived from the uniformity of its terraces.
 6. The proposed dormer would occupy over half of the rear roofslope with no setback from the shared boundary with No. 29 or from the eaves or ridge. As such, it would dominate the rear roofslope and represent a bulky and overly obtrusive addition to the appeal property. Furthermore, as the rear roofslope of the appeal property is particularly visible within public views along Antill Terrace, the proposed dormer would have a prominent appearance within the Conservation Area.
-

7. The appellant asserts that there is no regular pattern to the back elevations of the terrace due to existing and recently permitted schemes at Nos. 19 and 11. However, as those properties are positioned within the centre of the terrace, public views of the dormers there are limited and therefore any effect on the overall uniform appearance of the terrace is minimal. In contrast, the proposed dormer would be particularly prominent due to the end-of-terrace location of the appeal site and would therefore detract from the terrace's cohesive appearance.
8. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a similar dormer extension at No. 1. While I was not able to see any extension to No. 1, I was able to partially see a dormer extension to No. 1b. However, as this property falls outside of the Albert Gardens Conservation Area, it is not directly comparable to the proposal. I did see rear dormer extensions at Nos. 24 and 26, but these are on the eastern side of Senrab Street where there is much more variety along the rear roofscape of properties, compared to the relatively uniform appearance of the terrace of Nos. 1-31 Senrab Street. Therefore Nos. 24 and 26 are not directly comparable to the proposal.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area and the Albert Gardens Conservation Area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy DM24 of the Managing Development Document (2013) (MDD) and Policy S.DH1 of the Draft Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2019) (LP), which state that development must meet the highest standards of design; and MDD policy DM27 and LP policy S.DH3 which seek to preserve or enhance the Borough's heritage assets.
10. Although the harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area is less than substantial, there are no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

11. Referencing a recently submitted application at No. 3 Senrab Street, the appellant states that there is a clear demand for loft conversions. Regardless, this does not provide justification for the proposal for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR