

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/17/3166821
157 Plumstead Road SE18 7DY

- 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 K Kerai against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/2231/F, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use first floor from A1 to C3 with an additional 2nd Floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. From my site visit it was apparent that the first floor of the appeal site has been converted for residential use and the internal wall enclosing the entrance hall shown on drawing 02(A) Ground Floor Plan – Proposed has been constructed. I am therefore considering this appeal retrospectively but this has not affected my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the development is sustainable with particular regard to the management and storage of waste and the provision of cycle storage.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a small, terraced retail unit fronting the street with a single storey rear extension built pursuant to planning permission granted in 2008. The rear extension is built parallel with, and close to the rear and side boundaries. There is no public access to the rear of the terrace and consequently there is no rear access to the appeal site.
 5. There is no external space available for storage at the appeal site and therefore any cycle or refuse storage would have to be within the dwelling. The entrance hall is approximately one metre wide and is the only ground floor access for the dwelling. Given its width, and that it is the principal means of escape for the occupants of the first floor dwelling, the entrance hall is not a suitable location for storage.
-

6. I consider the appellant's suggestion that the kitchen is a suitable space for storage of waste between weekly collections to be unacceptable. Storage in the kitchen would be likely to result in the space becoming cluttered and would also mean storing waste in the food preparation area.
7. Drawing 08 Rear Elevation *Existing shows railings on the flat roof of the extension and the appellant makes reference to this space being used as a balcony, and which could also be used for the storage of waste. However, railings have not been installed and there is no access to the roof from the property other than through a window in a room being used as a bedroom. There is therefore no viable access to this space.
8. Policy 5.16 of the London Plan and Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (the Local Plan), amongst other things, seek to ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the natural and built environment by providing on-site waste management and dedicated recyclable waste storage space. I have shown that the appeal site has no dedicated storage area for recyclable waste or external storage for general waste. There is therefore conflict with both of these policies
9. I note that other similar properties in the area have no suitable storage space for waste or cycles. This is not however a factor that can outweigh the conflict I have found with the development plan in the case before me, which has to be determined in the light of current planning policy.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking into consideration all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR