



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2022

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20TH October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/22/3293504

15 Kingfield Street, London E14 3DD

- 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 Anderson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/21/02231, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension with hip to gable roof and dormer to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft extension with hip to gable roof and dormer to the rear at 15 Kingfield Street, London E14 3DD in accordance with the terms of the application, PA/21/02231, dated 7 October 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a simply designed two storey house located at the end of a terrace of 4 very similar palisaded properties. This terraced form of housing development is replicated on both sides of Kingfield Street, with terraces varying from 4 to 6 houses in length. These terraces were designed with hipped roofs to those houses at the end of the terrace, including that of the appeal property.
4. Generally, there is an evident uniformity and cohesive character and appearance to the terraces in Kingfield Street, including roof line. There have, however, been changes from hip to gable ends to a few end of terrace houses in the street, similar to that which would result from the proposed loft

conversion and extension, which have been brought to my attention by the Council and the appellant. Other properties in the wider area also appear to have undergone similar change from hipped roof to gable ends.

5. From my site visit, it was evident that these properties with hipped roof to gable ends, including those in Kingfield Street, did not appear to alter the coherent character of the terraces of which they formed part, including that of their roof lines. Rather, these alterations from hipped roof to gable ends appeared as a recessive type of change that did not have any significant effect in this regard. I see no reason why the same type of hipped to gable end in matching brickwork, as proposed, would not also appear as a recessive type of change to the appeal property and the terrace of which it forms part.
6. The proposed change from a hipped roof form to gable end and accompanying rear dormer extension would be in keeping with the variety of roof forms I have identified in the locality. I do not find that the additional bulk or design of the proposal would result in a discordant or incongruous addition, but would rather be a well massed alteration and addition to the appeal property, in keeping with the scale of the appeal property and other houses and terraces in the street. As such, it would reflect much of the existing appearance, character and spatial characteristics to be found in the area.
7. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would respond to its context and would not interrupt the rhythm of the street and would not result in any significant harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property, the terrace of which it forms part or surrounding area.

Conditions

8. Along with the standard conditions relating to timing of implementation and compliance with drawings, to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the local area I have attached a condition requiring materials that match the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR