



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/19/3229996

41 Kings Highway, Plumstead SE18 2BH

- 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 Natalie Gonul against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/0459/F, dated 7 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is subdivision of existing property and garden and ground floor extension to provide additional dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. There is some confusion with the description of the application, described on the Council's application form as a '*subdivision of existing property*', and the grounds of appeal that emphasises the site consists of two properties as there are two separate freehold titles attached to the property. However, the building is accessed by one independent front door to the whole property with one letterbox and no other access to bedroom accommodation. I am therefore firmly of the view that by all intents and purposes, the dwelling functions as a single 4-bedroom family dwelling and cannot reasonably be considered as two properties. Ownership and title do not necessarily reflect the use in planning terms. I have therefore considered the appeal based on the planning permission applied for as the subdivision of the property.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would result in a loss of family housing, contrary to development plan policy.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a traditional terrace of residential dwellings on a main road close to the junction with Black Princes Street. The property is two-storey with part of the first floor extending above a gated undercroft providing vehicular access to the rear of the property. The proposed ground floor rear extension is not in contention.

5. Policy H(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (CSWDP) 2014 states that amongst other criteria, the conversion of small and medium sized family dwellings with less than 130sqm of net floor area where they form part of a terrace will not be permitted. It goes on to state that permission will be granted for the sub-division of residential property provided it meets other specific requirements including adequate noise insulation and car parking.
6. The Council calculates the floor area of the property as a whole at 121.7m², which is not disputed by the appellant. Policy H(b)(i) is explicit in its requirements to protect family housing from subdivision and my findings are that as the appeal property functions as one single dwellinghouse of a size that constitutes family housing, therefore the proposal for subdivision is in direct conflict with Policy H(b)(i) of the CSWDP.
7. Although the appellant considers the development will follow the same design characteristics as the adjacent properties, and this is recognised, this does not outweigh the conflict with policy I have identified, and therefore the appeal should fail.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR