



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/22/3307283

59 Manchester Grove, Tower Hamlets, London E14 3BG

- 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 T Zhang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/22/01134, dated 16 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a side extension and loft conversion.
-

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 host property, local area, and that of the Chapel House Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a palisaded end of terrace two storey house with a modest irregular shaped wraparound garden and is located towards the junction of Manchester Grove with Manchester Road. The flank wall of the host dwelling faces towards the latter of these streets. The wider local area is predominantly residential in nature with a variety of housing types and ages, with some limited retail and other commercial properties nearby.
4. The CA within which the appeal site sits is recognised for its low density housing in short, terraced rows. The design of the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part is characteristic of the 'Garden City' model of development used for the Manchester Grove Estate. As such, it contributes to the significance of the CA.
5. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
6. The proposed single storey side extension would replace the existing enclosed side entrance porch, which is located in the middle of the flank wall of the host dwelling facing Manchester Road, but with a main entrance door facing

Manchester Grove. The proposed side extension would be to the full width of this flank wall, resulting in the front elevation of the proposed side extension aligning with the existing front elevation of the host dwelling and also with a front door also facing Manchester Grove.

7. The proposed side extension would project significantly further into the side garden of the host dwelling than the existing side porch. Toward the rear it would reduce in width, to follow the irregular shape of the garden of the host dwelling. It's roof would be of a canted hipped form with a small crown, with a small roof light to the roof slope facing Manchester Grove.
8. Due to the scale of the proposed side extension, it would appear to dominate the host dwelling and would fail to appear as a subservient addition. The scale of the proposed side extension would also result in a crown roof form with a shallower angle of pitch than the roof to the host dwelling. The proposal would, therefore, fail to reflect the design and scale of the host dwelling and would, therefore, appear as a dominating and incongruous addition.
9. Further, due to the end of terrace and corner location of the host dwelling, the proposed side extension would be prominent in the local streetscene. In street views its dominating and incongruous appearance, in relation to the host dwelling and terrace of which it forms part, would be unduly apparent. This would detract from the townscape and streetscene of the local area and its existing coherent character, particularly in relation to the modestly scaled two storey houses that front Manchester Grove.
10. In this regard, the proposal would also fail to reflect the contribution that the host dwelling, and the terrace of which it forms part, makes to the significance of the CA, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would be especially apparent in the wider views into the CA from the nearby road junction.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to two previous planning applications that incorporated side extensions to the host dwelling as part of their proposal. The proposed side extension is of the same scale and design as a proposed extension that formed part of a previously refused planning application. A further planning application subsequent to this refusal was made for a proposal that incorporated a side extension with a smaller footprint and a lower and what appears to be more steeply angled hipped roof without a crown roof element. This was also refused by the council, but was subsequently allowed on appeal.
12. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other side extensions in the local area that are similar in form and scale to that allowed on appeal. These existing extensions to other similar terraced properties to the host dwelling appear to be of similar scale and design of the proposed extension to the host dwelling allowed on appeal. However, the proposal allowed on appeal and the other existing extensions on similar properties in the CA appear to be more complementary in design and scale and with roof designs that more closely accord with and reflect that of their host dwellings. These would have been considered on their own individual merits and I have done likewise in my consideration of the appeal proposal. I have therefore given these only limited weight in my considerations.

13. I have also considered the proposal for the loft conversion incorporating single rooflights to the front and rear roof slopes of the host dwelling and alterations to the existing rear ground elevation that would see the removal of existing windows and the alteration of the rear entrance to incorporate larger French doors. I see no reason to demur from the conclusions drawn by the Council and the Inspector of the previously allowed appeal that these elements are not significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part or to the significance of the CA. Absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations.
14. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's view that the proposed side extension part of the proposal would allow them to create the type of space they envisage, this would represent a predominantly private rather than public benefit, to which I can only give moderate weight in my considerations.
15. For these reasons, I find that the proposal when considered as a whole would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal properties and that of the local area. This would be contrary to policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2020) (the Local Plan), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework), which collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design and integrate with the local area.
16. Further, the excessive scale of the proposed side extension and its concomitant effect of the proposed roof design and angles of this aspect of the proposal, would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. The proposed development would not, therefore, be in accordance with policy S.DH3 of the Local Plan and policy HC1 of the London Plan and section 16 of the Framework, which collectively seek to ensure that development has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets and conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

Conclusion

17. As no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh the harm that I have identified above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR