
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/W/21/3268080

4 Ambassador Square, London, E14 9UX

- 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 Rakesh Patel against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/20/02069, dated 24 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is part three storey side extension with single storey rear extension protruding from the original side wall of the dwelling with no return at the rear.
-

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 Matters

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submission in respect of the publication. No further comments have been received.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 4 is a three-storey semi-detached House of Multiple Occupation (HMO), which is symmetrically paired with No. 5, located on Ambassador Square. This pair is attached to another pair, Nos. 6 and 7. Ambassador Square is a cul-de-sac which is accessed from Cahir Street. There is also a public footpath which leads from Spindrift Avenue into Ambassador Square, which is just beside the boundary wall at the west elevation of the appeal property where the proposal would be located. The surrounding area is residential, and Ambassador Square

is predominantly characterised by pairs of three-storey properties with gable roofs and a strong consistency in the materials and fenestration pattern. This presents a neat, unified appearance within this cul-de-sac which is a positive characteristic.

6. The proposed side extension would have the same eaves height as the existing property, but be stepped down at the ridge and set back behind the front elevation of the host property with a stepped design. It would extend to a width more than half the width of the original property. Although this width is at the maximum at the rear, it would still be perceived at the façade of the property and hence would not appear subservient to the host property. Furthermore, by virtue of the step downs and setbacks, the extension would have an oddly shaped roof which would be a combination of gable and hipped design, and a disjointed staggered appearance at the front and side. Although the extension would respect the materials and window design of the neighbouring properties, it would appear as a discordant feature which would unbalance the symmetry between the host property and its pair, No. 5, and the contribution they make to the square.
7. The extension would be viewed from within the square, as well as from Cahir Street. It would not be comparable in either shape or form with the pair at Nos. 6 and 7 Ambassador Square. The proposal would also be visible from the path to the side of the appeal site and, to a limited extent, from Spindrift Avenue and would appear odd from these positions by virtue of its irregular shape and roof form. It would be an inconsistent design which would be visually harmful when viewed from all of these viewpoints.
8. The appellant suggests the proposal would make a better use of the property, including its garden, and would remove a poorly constructed rear extension. However, these are of little benefit to the wider public and do not outweigh the public harm resulting from the development.
9. I find that the proposed development would significantly harm the visual appearance of the host dwelling and is inconsistent with the established character of the area. Accordingly, there would be conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020) which amongst other things seeks to ensure that new developments are of good design and provide coherent building lines which complements streetscape rhythm.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The development does not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations to suggest the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
11. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS 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 with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR