



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021  
by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

### Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 June 2021

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/21/3267753

#### 12 Wheat Sheaf Close, London E14 9UU

- 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 Abdus Subhan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
  - The application Ref PA/20/01818, dated 27 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as "proposed loft conversion with a rear dormer and x2 roof lights to the front".
- 

### 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.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a mid-terraced dwelling in a residential area. Immediate surrounding properties vary in scale and layout but share a notable consistency in style and design, including predominantly unaltered roofscapes.
5. The proposed dormer would be constructed from matching materials, with aligned fenestration and set back slightly from the eaves and below ridge height. Nonetheless, the set in would be minimal such that it would span most of the width of the property. As such it would be a prominent addition, dominating the rear roofscape. It would not appear as a subordinate feature adequately contained within the roof profile but would introduce substantial additional bulk that would not respect the character and proportions of the property, causing visual harm.
6. While the dormer would not be seen from the front elevation of the dwelling, it would be highly visible from the communal car park to the rear. Here the site is viewed as part of a row of terraced dwellings of similar scale and proportions, with a notable uninterrupted roof line. In this context the proposal would appear as an out of place addition, creating a visual break in the roofscape and resulting in a

jarring feature. In this context the incongruous nature of the proposal would be further highlighted as it would interrupt the common character that defines this immediate group of properties.

7. While front roof lights are not common features in the locality, the limited scale and subtle positioning of the them would ensure that they would not cause significant harm in their own right. Nonetheless, when assessed in combination with the dormer element, the overall impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area would be unacceptable.
8. For the reasons given above I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would fail to accord with Policy D.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031, adopted January 2020, which seeks to promote good design. This policy is in broad conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which at paragraph 127 requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character, and paragraph 124 which sets out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

### **Other Matters**

9. The appellant has referred to development at other properties, including where certificates of lawful development have been granted. No such certificate is before me in this case. Nonetheless, the proposal should be assessed on its own site-specific circumstances. Reference to other dormers nearby does not outweigh the harm identified above due to the precise location of the host dwelling and the context of the immediate surrounding character visible from the site.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to paragraphs in the Framework which he considers support the proposal including that it would represent effective use of the site, optimising its potential in meeting the need for homes and other uses. Given the overall limited contribution of the proposal in this regard, these matters do not attract sufficient weight to outweigh the harm identified above. Moreover, the Framework and the development plan need to be read as a whole.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

*C Rafferty*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

*RC Kirby*

INSPECTOR