



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/D/25/3376343

66 Tiller Road, Tower Hamlets, London E14 8NN

- 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 Mrs Ning Wong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref is PA/25/01221.
 - The development proposed is dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a terraced block of houses where two central dwellings lie close to the road, with two pairs of dwellings backing onto each other set back from the road either side of the central block. The appeal dwelling is set back from but facing Tiller Road. Although there is a variety of building styles in the wider residential area, the appeal site is within a modern estate of two storey dwellings comprising similar building forms with pitched tiled roofs. The roof spaces of houses on this estate facing the street have not been extended, giving a consistency and rhythm to the roofscape.
4. The proposal is to install two flat roof dormers facing the road, providing additional, more adaptable accommodation space and improved energy efficiency within a dwelling in inner London, and making more efficient use of land in line with national and London planning policies. Taking account of the Inspector's comments when dismissing an appeal for a larger single dormer at 40 Claire Place¹, the proposed dormers would be set back from the eaves, set down from the ridge and well separated from each other. They would also broadly align with the windows below.
5. Nevertheless, due to their size, the proposed dormers would obscure a significant amount of the original pitched roof. Their siting on the road facing elevation would introduce an incongruous feature, harmfully disrupting the uniformity and rhythm of the roofscape on this housing estate. The proposed materials may reflect those of

¹ Appeal ref APP/E5900/D/16/3166217

the host property, but this does not overcome the visual harm arising from the introduction of projecting front roof extensions. Although set back from the street, the dormers would be evident in public views, particularly to those travelling eastbound along Tiller Road.

6. A dormer has previously been approved on the same terrace at 74 Tiller Road², but this lies to the rear of the block and is not visible from the public realm so is not comparable to the scheme before me. The front dormers further along at 17a, 17, 19 and 21 Tiller Road are closer to the highway than the proposed roof extension. However, in contrast to the appeal scheme, some are consistent roofscape features as part of the development whilst others are on an individually designed detached house, rather than part of a uniformly designed housing estate.
7. There is reference to a front dormer allowed on appeal at 112 Bow Common Lane³ which subsequently enabled approvals of similar schemes on the same terrace. Nevertheless, unlike the appeal site, these were on an individual block rather than part of a wider estate. There is no certainty that allowing the proposed development would result in similar schemes on road facing dwellings in the estate, nor harmonisation of the roofscape in the longer term.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031, adopted January 2020, which requires development to positively respond to its context, amongst other things.

Other Matters

9. The Council did not find harm or development plan conflict in relation to other matters, including neighbouring or future living conditions. In addition, there were no objections from neighbouring occupiers. Nonetheless, even if I were to agree with the Council on these points, the absence of harm would be a neutral matter which would not carry weight in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR

² Planning permission ref PA/15/00657/NC

³ Planning appeal ref APP/E5900/D/15/3131598