



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3240259

25 Barlow Drive, Woolwich SE18 4NE

- 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 Derek Williams against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3007/HD, dated 28 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2019.
 - The proposed development is conversion of existing garage into a habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing garage into a habitable room at 25 Barlow Drive, Woolwich SE18 4NE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/3007/HD, dated 28 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: DRG/190826/03.1, DRG/190826/04.1 and DRG/190826/05.1.
 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.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a three-storey, mid-terrace property with an integrated garage. The surrounding area is formed by terraces of similar properties. During my site visit, I observed that several properties within the surrounding area had converted their garages to form habitable rooms. As such conversions are commonly seen in the surrounding area, I consider that the
-

proposal would not appear incongruous within the immediate context of the appeal site. Furthermore, as the proposed external alterations would be limited to ground floor level, I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the overall character and appearance of the appeal property, the terrace or wider area.

5. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy DH1 of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which state that development proposals should be of the highest quality, respond to local character and take account of the architecture of surrounding buildings. However, I do not consider that Policy DH(a) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies is relevant as it relates specifically to residential extensions and is therefore not relevant to this appeal.

Conditions

6. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. Regard has been given to advice on imposing conditions in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
7. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. In the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that materials used in the construction of the proposed development match those of the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR