



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

**by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/W/25/3364559**

**45 Globe Road, London E1 4DY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Ruhul Amin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
  - The application Ref is PA/25/00089.
  - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. As set out on the application form, development has started and is now complete. However, my assessment of the proposal is based on the plans before the Council at the time of the planning application. I will refer to the proposed development in the future tense throughout my decision, although certain aspects may already be completed.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
  - The character and appearance of the area; and
  - The living conditions of existing residential occupiers with particular reference to outlook and light.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal site forms part of a four-storey residential block of flats. 47 Globe Road which sits next door to the appeal property benefits from an existing single storey rear extension. It is proposed to erect a single storey rear extension at the appeal property, and this is shown on the proposed plans to extend up to and beyond the existing rear wall of the extension at No 47.
5. While examples of development to the rear already exist at No 47, the depth of this existing extension is proportionate to the host building. It is, nonetheless, a generous projection and given its height, rearward projection, and prominence in the streetscape, it sits at the outer limits of acceptability.

6. The appeal development is shown on the proposed plans to extend 1210mm beyond the existing rear projection at No 47 to a total proposed rear projection of 4920mm from the host building. It would also be finished in materials which would be sensitive to the existing building and neighbouring properties.
7. However, the proposed rear projection with its prominent location, and its proposed height, length and visibility above the existing wall and fencing, would be experienced as an intrusive and dominant feature which would fail to positively respond to the proportions and characteristics of the host building or the wider townscape. The proposed development would not positively respond to its context when viewed from the street scene and public vantage points.
8. Therefore, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area would be unacceptable. The proposed development would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2020. These, amongst other things, look to promote attractive, high-quality design which responds to local distinctiveness and legibility of place.

### *Living Conditions*

9. The proposed development is shown on the plans as 2980mm high and 4920mm deep. The neighbour at 43 Globe Road does not have a rear extension and the proposed development would extend a significant distance beyond the rear windows of No 43.
10. The height, depth, and proximity of the proposed development to the garden area and rear windows at No 43 would create a significant and uninterrupted wall of development. While no technical daylight/sunlight studies have been submitted, the depth of the proposed development is significant, this in combination with its height and proximity to No 43 would cause an unacceptable deterioration of light which enters the private outdoor space and rear windows of this neighbour. For the same reasons it would also have an overbearing impact when viewed from these windows and garden area unacceptably affecting the outlook from No 43 as well.
11. Concluding on this main issue, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of existing residential occupants with particular reference to outlook and light. The proposal would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D.DH8 of the Local Plan. This, amongst other things, address the need for high quality design to protect the living conditions of existing buildings and their occupants.

### **Other Matters**

12. I have carefully considered the reasons given for the proposed development. There are mobility issues associated with a disabled occupier who is required to live downstairs, and the Appellant is a carer for two residents who live with him. I have no doubt that their need for his support places significant demands on the Appellant. I also fully appreciate the impact of a recent bereavement and the deep emotional attachment the occupiers have for the existing property.

13. During my site visit I entered the appeal property and saw the layout for myself. All the issues raised in evidence are profoundly understood, and I do not dismiss them lightly. I appreciate that an extension would go some way to ease the burden on the occupiers while providing dignity and comfort in their daily lives. I also appreciate that any demolition or remedial work would be disruptive to the occupiers.
14. However, the harms I have identified would be significant and long lasting. It has not been robustly shown in evidence why an extension of this particular scale and depth would be required, or that anything smaller would be unsuitable for meeting the needs of the occupiers. Therefore, while the needs of the occupiers are a material consideration to my decision, they do not outweigh the overall harm I have found.
15. I also note that most neighbouring properties did not object to the development, I have taken this into account. However, the development plan requires me to assess the impact of the proposed development both on the character and appearance of the area but also whether it would have any unneighbourly effects on the adjoining dwellings. This I have done in the preceding paragraphs and while the low level of public objection is noted, it does not alter my conclusions as set out above.

### **Conclusion**

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole and for this reason the appeal should be dismissed. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision should be made contrary to this conclusion.

*N Praine*

INSPECTOR