



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/21/3271523

61 Hesperus Crescent, London, E14 3AB

- 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 & Mrs Bora & Julia Alpar against the decision of London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/20/02724, dated 18 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a pitched roof rear single storey extension, loft conversion with rear dormer loft window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There was an initial discrepancy over the names of the appellants'. Written confirmation has been received that the appeal is by the original applicants Mr & Mrs Bora & Julia Alpar.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chapel House Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The significance of the Chapel House CA, which the site is in, includes, groups of terraces of a modest character, fine proportions, and traditional materials. These terraces are set back from the highway with front gardens and low boundary walls. Each terrace forms a separate block set beneath a single uniform roof line, with the space between the terrace rows fundamental to the legibility of the layout. Whilst some dwellings have made alterations to the roof, the form of the terraces can still be understood. Consequently, the roofscape of the area is generally undisturbed retaining the proportions of the terraces.
5. The appeal property is a traditional two-storey hipped roofed end terrace. The adjoining row of terraces matches that of the host dwelling with respect to materials, ridge and building lines, and relationship with the street scene. While not listed or locally listed, these attributes, and the property make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or

enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect, national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (Framework).

7. The addendum to the Chapel House CA Character Appraisal acknowledges space pressures facing families and the need to accommodate changing residential needs within the CA. Indeed, there are a number of properties in the locality which have been altered or extended in some way.
8. However, the appeal property has retained the original hipped roof form and a clear sense of balance and symmetry. Whilst the proposed dormer would be set down from the ridge line and would not extend across to the side of the property, it would sit flush with the side hip slope of the roof. It would also occupy nearly all of the rear roof slope. Despite the use of matching materials, the dormer would be an unduly dominant feature giving rise to disproportionate bulk at roof level and an incongruous appearance in the streetscene.
9. There are examples of roof extensions to other properties in the CA including an existing dormer located on the rear of the same terrace. However, these are different in style and are predominantly located outside of public view or partially screened by the roof slope of the host dwelling. The introduction of a dormer on this end-terrace, following the side hip slope of the roof, would erode the generally undisturbed row of properties. In this regard, existing dormers are materially different to the proposal as they assimilate with the roof of host dwellings, wider streetscene and character of the CA.
10. Front rooflights, similar to that proposed, are a common feature in the surrounding area and for this reason, I find the proposal would have a neutral effect on the CA. The Council does not object to this part of the appeal, and I find no reason to disagree.
11. The proposed single-storey rear extension would replace an existing extension and further extend the rear of the dwelling. Whilst the extension would share the same pitch as the existing dwelling. It would also be set below first floor cill level and below ground level with large rooflights on 2 elevations. Nonetheless, the height and bulk of the hipped roof of the extension would appear uncomfortably out of proportion with the modest scale of the host dwelling. The insertion of large roof lights would also appear at odds with the modest character of the host dwelling. Other existing rear extensions within the wider CA are generally more flat-roofed or of a lower pitch, thus maintaining the dominance of the original dwellings.
12. No objection has been received from the Conservation Officer regarding the rear extension. However, I find that harm would, nevertheless, result from the extension's design not respecting the prevailing pattern of development of the wider CA. The extension would not sit comfortably at the rear of the existing dwelling and would fail to respond positively to its context given its height and bulky form detracting from the modest proportions of the host dwelling.
13. The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. The Framework indicates that such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. However, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation.

14. No evidence has been submitted to show any public benefits. The appellants' are seeking to create a larger family home and even if this were a public benefit, given the scale of the scheme the benefit would be small and as such, the public benefits do not outweigh the identified material harm to the designated heritage asset.
15. I, therefore, conclude that the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, it would conflict with the objectives of Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020) which requires new development to respect distinctive character and Policy S.DH3 which requires proposals to preserve the borough's designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

16. The appellants' submitted a pre-application to the council with the proposal being amended based on the advice received. Advice from the council is not binding and their conduct does not alter my findings on the main issue. I have found the proposal would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
18. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR