



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025

by **A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/25/3368321**

**21 Baldock Street, London E3 2TP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Aksel Etingu against the decision of Tower Hamlets Council.
  - The application Ref is PA/25/00791.
  - The application is for rear dormer roof extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Fairfield Road Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid terrace house likely dating to the Edwardian period that exhibits very nice quality detailing to its front elevation including contrasting brick quoining, stone details and rendered gable front bay elevation. The property is within the street of similar houses all of a similar age and design and is located within the adopted Fairfield Road Conservation Area (CA). To the rear the property has a single storey outshut extension and rear garden that ends to the edge of the main Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach road that is a major carriageway of several lanes running alongside the River Lee.
4. The CA is primarily characterised by its mixed industrial character (epitomised by the Bryant and May Match Works Factory) and associated workers housing and other social institutions. The terrace is of an obvious architectural quality where traditional fenestration, materials and details survive well. The house is therefore of an obviously attractive quality and I consider that it, along with most of its neighbours, contribute in a positive manner to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
5. The proposal before me seeks to create a loft conversion with slate clad box dormer to the rear elevation of the property and rooflight windows to the front roof slope. The dormer would take up nearly the entire roof slope although a small 20cm set in from eaves and from the ridge would be conceded to. In this regard it would be similar to a nearby rear dormer which, although this was approved, is the only such intervention of its type in the terrace.

6. In considering whether to grant planning permission I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to give 'Special Attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Fairfield Road Conservation Area. The statutory duties within the Act are reflected in The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that 'Great Weight' should be given to the heritage assets' conservation and also illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities. This is also reflected in policies D1, HC1 and D4 of The London Plan and policies S.DH1 and S.DH3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 which seek to manage change in the historic environment and ensure good design.
7. The proposal before me would introduce a very large box dormer to the rear elevation of this property and would represent the second such intervention to the rear of the terrace as a whole. Although the Appellant's Appeal Statement suggests that such a feature would be somehow subordinate and proportionate, I am at great pains to see how this is the case as it would blatantly dominate and take up nearly the whole of the rear roof slope. This would have the effect of creating something like a second floor flat roof rear extension which would considerably alter the character of the terrace.
8. Although not overly visible from the nearside footpath along the Blackwall Tunnel the dormer would be clearly visible by traffic moving along this road and would, moreover, be visible from adjoining gardens where this edifice would appear completely out of scale and wholly insensitive to its historic context.
9. The 200mm set in from the eaves and the ridge is purely tokenistic and fails to mitigate in any way this overly dominant and poorly designed intervention. As such there is little doubt in my mind that this scheme would cause significant harm to what is a relatively unadulterated roof scape within this historic area. In turn such harm would have a cumulative effect upon the wider character of the CA through the erosion of traditional details and surviving features of the terrace here.
10. Despite there being other examples locally that the Appellant advances as reasons to support this appeal, I do not have the precise reasons as to why these schemes were allowed nor the precise details of their design before me. As such I can give these other examples only very limited weight. Although there is a similar dormer extension to number 19 Baldock Terrace of which I understand was granted consent prior to the present Local Plan, I consider that this dormer has created a level of harm and is a precedent that would be highly undesirable to follow. I do not consider therefore that historic interventions that are similar are sufficient to justify more poor design responses.
11. Ultimately this proposal represents a wholly inappropriate design response and fails to take account of the special architectural and historic quality of the Conservation Area. As such this proposal is in conflict with policies D1, HC1 and D4 of The London Plan and policies S.DH1 and S.DH3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 as well as the requirements for development within the historic environment to be sensitive and contextual as advanced in the NPPF. As such this appeal must fail.

## **Conclusion**

12. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Fairfield Road Conservation Area and for the reasons given above, whilst taking into account all other matters raised, I must dismiss this appeal.

*A Graham*

INSPECTOR