



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/21/3272828

126 Corfield Street, London E2 ODS

- 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 Anthony Koumi against the decision of London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
- The application Ref PA/20/02091, dated 29 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
- The development proposed is erection of two storey part single storey rear extension.

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 effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Reasons

4. No. 126 is a two-storey property with its rear elevation overlooking Finnis Street. The rear is set back from both the neighbouring properties, one of which is adjoined to No. 126. Despite the staggered building line, there are a number of similarities with No. 126 and the adjoining properties to the north, in terms of the pitched roof profiles, scale and style of dwellings. This results in a pleasant and attractive rhythm to the street. The neighbouring property to the south, which as noted is also set forward of the rear elevation of No. 126 sits close to but is physically disconnected. This property sits on a prominent corner and has an overall different design, scale and form to the majority of other properties in the street.
5. The proposal seeks a two-storey rear extension which would incorporate a pair of hipped roofs with a central valley and a single storey flat roof element. Given the design, scale and form of the proposed roof it would appear at odds with the existing pitched roof of No. 126 and the prevailing pitched roofs in the street. It would introduce an uncharacteristic and juxtaposed element at roof level, to which the eye would be drawn, and it would result in the overall development appearing incongruous within the streetscape. The proposal

would therefore break up the existing rhythm within the streetscape and would draw unwelcome emphasis to the overall scale of the extension.

6. I appreciate that the roof profile of the neighbouring corner properties have a different design, scale, and form to the majority of other properties overlooking Finnis Street. However, these corner properties are not considered to be comparable to the host property given their very different characteristics and site-specific circumstances. They do not provide justification for the proposal.
7. The proposal would, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, particularly as a result of the design, scale and form of the proposed roof. Consequently the proposal would conflict with Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2031) *Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits*, which requires that new development proposals should represent similar roof lines and formations thereby complementing and enhancing the existing streetscape particularly those that have an existing rhythm.

Other Matters

8. The appellant notes that the proposal would remove the existing overshadowing that occurs as a result of the forward position of the neighbouring property, No. 200 Finnis Street. However, any degree of overshadowing is existing and does not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area. I have attached limited weight to this point.
9. The appellant has noted that the proposal would comply with the new London Plan but has not provided copies of these Policies. I cannot therefore determine whether the proposal complies with these and therefore cannot apply any weight to this point.
10. The appellant notes that the proposal would improve the accommodation and housing stock. However, there is no evidence that this could not be achieved by way of an alternative design which would not impact on the character and appearance of No. 126 or the surrounding area. Only limited weight can therefore be attached to this matter.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

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