
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2022

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/21/3280434
139 Chrisp Street, London E14 6NH

- 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 Duc Cung Nguyen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/21/00539, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a 2-storey, flat roofed, end terrace dwelling located on the western side of Chrisp Street. No 139 is at the south-eastern end of a wider planned housing development of similarly styled 2-storey flat roofed dwellings that broadly share the same scale, simple building form, and rhythm of fenestration. This wider grouping of similar dwellings is arranged with back-to-back rear gardens separated by an alleyway that provides direct access to the rear gardens. Although there is some variation in the detailing of these dwellings, the shared form, scale and layout of the wider housing development provides a distinct and cohesive character.
4. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 6 m to the rear of the original dwelling. Whilst the extension would share the same flat roof form as the existing dwelling, the 6 m depth of the extension would appear uncomfortably out of proportion with the modest scale of the host dwelling. Other existing rear extensions within the wider housing development are more limited in their rearward projection, thus maintaining the dominance of the original dwellings. I acknowledge that the extension would not be readily visible from public vantage points, and this limits the harm to the appearance of the area. Harm would, nevertheless, result from the extension's rearward projection not respecting the prevailing pattern of development of the wider housing development. The extension would not sit comfortably at the rear of the existing dwelling and would fail to respond positively to its context.

5. The proposal would, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2020) which requires, amongst other things, development proposals to respect and respond positively to the local character of an area. For similar reasons, the proposal fails to accord with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

6. My attention has been drawn to 2 examples of extensions on Chrisp Street. The extension at 153 Chrisp Street projected approximately 3.2 m to the rear of the original elevation, a significantly smaller rear projection than the current proposal. The extension at Chrisp Street Health Centre has an entirely different spatial context and is not directly comparable to the current proposal. As such, I give very limited weight to these previous developments.
7. I acknowledge that the proposal could be said to make more efficient use of the site. However, the Framework is clear that making efficient use of land should include taking into account the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and the importance of securing well-designed places.
8. I also note that the appellant advises that the proposal would be capable of implementation under the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) subject to a prior notification application. However, that is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Conclusion

9. The proposal is not in accordance with the development plan when taken as a whole. Overall, there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, of sufficient weight to outweigh the identified conflict with the development plan.
10. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR