

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/21/3282282

Site Address: 36 Alpha Grove, LONDON E14 8LH

- 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 Bilal Haque against the decision of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/21/01333, dated 12 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey upward extension over existing footprint of house.
-

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 Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The main parties were provided an opportunity to comment on the updated Framework and no comments were received.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling with a predominantly brick finish and flat roof. Although there are buildings of mixed height within its locality, the appeal site is joined with 3 other dwellings to form a block of 4 houses, which sits within a cluster of a significant number architecturally similar houses. The application seeks permission for a single storey extension on top of the existing footprint.
6. The proposed upward extension would add significant bulk to the host dwelling and interrupt the otherwise consistent and established roofline of this cluster of

houses. The introduction of an additional storey would appear incongruous when it is considered within the immediate context of the site and the relatively uniform cluster of dwellings within which it sits. Despite there being taller buildings nearby that contribute to the surrounding context of the appeal site, these clearly possess a different character and appearance to the cluster.

7. There are some policies which do encourage upward extensions; however, this is only in situations where such development is appropriate. The proposed development would be highly visible from the public realm, specifically from Alpha Grove. The proposed height and bulk of the development would appear discordant and would not be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene and therefore this would not be an appropriate circumstance for an upward extension.
8. For the reasons given above the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would therefore not comply with Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Borough Council Local Plan 2031, adopted 2020. This Policy requires development to meet the highest standards of design and be of an appropriate scale, height, bulk and form in its context.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has expanding accommodation needs with associated issues relating to affordability and a desire to not move from a familiar area. Accommodating this would be a private benefit for a single household, limited weight should therefore be given to this. The proposed development would result in fundamental harm to the character and appearance of the area, and this would not be outweighed by the personal circumstances of the appellant. In addition, this appeal has been assessed on its individual merits and the possibility of future planning applications being received relating to dwellings within the cluster cannot be guaranteed and so it holds very limited weight in its determination.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

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.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR