
Appeal Decision

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

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/21/3272206 74 Carmen Street, London E14 6NW

- 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 Nishan Mohit against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/20/02479, dated 20 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is addition of one storey over existing residential dwelling.
-

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. Since the Council issued its decision the London Plan 2021 has been adopted, which now forms part of the development plan and supersedes the London Plan 2016 referenced in the decision. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on this change in policy. In my recommendation I have had regard to those policies of the new London Plan which I have been referred to by the parties.
4. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework on 20 July 2021. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No. 74 is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located at the junction of Carmen Street and Chrisp Street. It is part of a relatively uniform terrace of flat roofed two-storey dwellings with a parapet around the roof. This parapet line is unaltered and uninterrupted by any form of roof extension. The terrace is surrounded by taller buildings, including some high-rise apartment blocks. As a distinct contrast to these larger structures, the modest scale of the terrace makes it a distinct feature at this location and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed additional storey would sit on top the flat roof and cover the entire depth and width of the appeal property. Due to its scale and height, it would not be subservient to the host property. It would give the property a top-heavy appearance and be distinctly at odds with the existing modest scale of the building. As such, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property.
8. Additionally, the increase in height by an additional storey would interrupt the uniform height of the terrace and unbalance this end of it. As such, it would be an incongruous addition which would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and diminish its contribution to the street scene.
9. The awkward design of the proposal would be prominent in this highly visible location at a busy junction and therefore would detract from the quality of the street scene. As part of a terrace, it would be markedly different to the unified designs of the taller structures in the local area; therefore, the presence of these taller buildings does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
10. Consequently, due to its form, bulk and design, the proposed additional storey would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building, the terrace and street scene. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020) which seeks to achieve good design that responds to context and contributes positively to the public realm. It would also conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 insofar as it seeks to deliver good design.
11. The Council's decision cites Local Plan Policy D.DH2 however I have not been provided with a copy of this policy and as such I have not been able to take it into account in coming to my recommendation.
12. The proposal would provide more living space, could make the building more energy efficient and would intensify the use of the site in a sustainable location, however these benefits would be minor and do not outweigh the harm identified above. The lack of harm in other respects, including the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, access and parking, is of neutral consequence and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. 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

14. 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.

L McKay

INSPECTOR