



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/20/3244574 239 Brick Lane, London E2 7ED

- 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 Jason Needham against the decision of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Council.
 - The application Ref PA/19/02371, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a small dormer window to the front portion of the existing main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. 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.

Procedural issue

3. Following the Council's determination of the planning application, in January 2020 it adopted the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing Benefits (the Local Plan). The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on relevant policy from the Local Plan and therefore I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a three-storey terraced property located on the western side of Brick Lane, opposite the junction with Tomlinson Close. The dwelling forms part of a staggered block of post-war brick-built terraces defined by a strong uniform roof line. The surrounding area is mainly residential and is characterised by a mix of 20th Century housing blocks and three-storey Victorian properties with ground floor retail units.
6. While the materials would match the host property, the proposal would result in a front dormer roof extension which would be set back from the eaves and

extend across the full width of the roof. As a result, the large size of the extension creates a bulky dominant mass of roof slope that would disrupt the rhythm of the roof line along this block of terraces owing to the fact that no other properties have erected dormer extensions. It would thus appear as an incongruous addition to the dwelling and would feature prominently within the street scene due to its position within the front roof slope.

7. Although the appellant states that the volume of the development has been reduced when compared to a previous proposal, I find it would still be read as an obtrusive and intrusive feature.
8. I acknowledge that a similar development was constructed at 78 Virginia Road to the north of the appeal site however it is a rear dormer and is not as visible within the street scene. It is therefore not directly comparable to the proposal put before me. Within the appellants Design and Access Statement, my attention is also drawn to other roof extensions within Tower Hamlets. However, I saw that these are very much in the minority and not sufficiently close the appeal site to alter the dominant uniform character and appearance of the roof form in the vicinity of the appeal site. Furthermore, I do not know the specific circumstances of these cases which led to them being acceptable. In any event, the evidence before me confirms my view that the mass and bulk of such extensions can be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, they do not alter my view that the proposed development is poorly designed, bulky, and would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace as a whole, and the surrounding area.
9. In light of the foregoing, the proposal would conflict with Policy S.DH1 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure new development meets the highest standards of design which respects and positively responds to its context and townscape.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR