



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3226529

54 Moordown, Plumstead SE18 3NQ

- 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 Mrs S Thomas against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/4063/HD, dated 23 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "extension of existing outbuilding to provide a granny annexe at rear of 54 Moordown SE18 3NQ".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of an existing outbuilding to provide a granny annexe at the rear of 54 Moordown Plumstead SE18 3NQ, in accordance with the terms of application ref: 18/4063/HD, dated 23 November 2018 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: M.54/03; M.54/04 Rev A; M.54/01 Rev A; M.54/02 Rev A.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 4. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 54 Moordown, Plumstead, SE18 3NQ.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The application to the Council was a resubmission of an earlier, refused, application for an outbuilding of a greater height¹. I do not have details of that

¹ Application ref: 18/3176/HD

proposal before me and, in any event, I have treated the appeal on its own merits.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 54 Moordown is an extended end of terrace dwelling located in a prominent corner position at a roundabout. Land levels around the site slope noticeably such that the house, and the single storey outbuilding to which this appeal relates, lie in an elevated position and are visible from a wide area. The outbuilding, which is single storey, is located in the side/rear garden of the property, next to the rear boundary, at a lower level than the host dwelling.
6. The surrounding area is a well-established residential area, generally characterised by terraces of dwellings set out in a linear form fronting the roads. At road junctions' properties are set at an angle in more spacious plots. I noted that some corner properties have been extended or, as at the appeal site, have a separate domestic outbuilding.
7. The proposal seeks to increase the footprint of the existing outbuilding which would, in effect, bring the outbuilding closer to the host dwelling and to the side boundary of the site adjacent to the highway. The extended building, which would be converted into a granny annex and would accommodate a bedroom, shower room, store and living area, would have a pitched roof with rooflights inserted into both roof slopes and openings facing the host dwelling, the garden area and the street. The height of the building would not be altered.
8. The development would increase the overall size of the outbuilding and increase its prominence within the streetscene. Nevertheless, it would still be set well back from the side boundary facing the highway, at a right angle to it, and would not project beyond the building line defined by the terraced properties located to the north of the appeal site. Furthermore, the building would be sited at a lower level than the host dwelling.
9. The Design and Access Statement accompanying the proposal advises that the annex would have a footprint of around 46 sqm. This is not disputed by the Council. At that size it would be considerably less than the footprint of the surrounding terraced blocks of dwellings. Moreover, the building would occupy only a limited portion of what is a large garden. Accordingly, the building would not dominate or be detrimental to its plot. Given its siting, height and overall scale, the outbuilding would remain subservient to the host dwelling despite its increased size.
10. For these reasons, whilst I acknowledge that the enlarged building would be visible from Conover Crescent and from certain vantage points along Moordown it would not cause any greater harm to the character and appearance of the area than the existing structure.
11. In light of the above, I conclude that the appeal development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Consequently, the development would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, and Policies DH1, and DH(a) of the Core Strategy 2014, which amongst other things, support developments that are designed to be subservient to the host property and appropriate for the locality.

Conditions and Recommendation

12. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have recommended the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have specified that matching materials are used in the development. I have imposed a condition limiting the occupation of the annex to ensure the accommodation remains ancillary to the main dwelling. I have altered the wording of that condition to be more precise and to reflect guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and have changed the details of the host property, as the suggested condition refers to a different site.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to these conditions.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR