The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022 by Max Webb BA(Hons)

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3285468
262 Burrage Road, Plumstead Common SE18 7JP

- 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 Ms Marcia Olasemo against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref 20/3195/HD, dated 9 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
- The development is removal of two existing sheds and retention of an outbuilding.

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 5 May 2022.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for removal of two existing sheds and retention of an outbuilding at 262 Burrage Road, Plumstead Common SE18 7JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/3195/HD, dated 9 September 2020.

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.

Applications for Costs

3. An application for costs was made by Ms Marcia Olasemo against the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. The description of the development used in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it provides a more accurate description of the development than that which is given on the application form.

5. The original planning application was made retrospectively, although the two existing sheds are still in place. The appeal has therefore been considered on a part-retrospective basis.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Plumstead Common Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site is located in the Plumstead Common Conservation Area (CA). The Plumstead Common Conservation Area: Character Appraisal (adopted 2010) outlines how the CA was designated to protect and enhance an area of ancient Common Land, together with the Victorian dwellings and other buildings on its rim which contribute to its setting. The significance of the area is therefore largely derived from the quality of the built form, mainly in the form of terraces with relatively large rear gardens, and their relationship to the Common Land. The appeal site is an end terraced property with a large rear garden and two existing sheds located to the rear. It sits within a wider terrace close to the Common Land and contributes positively to the significance of the CA. Most rear gardens in the vicinity of the appeal site contain sheds, some of which are large. Whilst many are located on the rear boundary, some are positioned closer to the main dwelling, more centrally in the garden.

8. The development is a shed located away from the rear boundary, as well as the proposed removal of the two existing sheds. Although large, the shed takes up a relatively small part of the garden and appears proportional to the appeal site. The two existing sheds to the rear of the garden are proposed to be removed and, whilst not imperative, if this were to happen it would further help to ensure the development would not dominate the garden. The shed is not particularly wide, quite low and set a reasonable distance from the appeal property. It would thus appear subordinate to both the garden and the host building.

9. I have seen no evidence to suggest that there is any enforcement action being pursued in respect of existing sheds. Regardless of whether the larger sheds in the vicinity of the appeal site are unauthorised, they do form part of the character of the area. Furthermore, the development would only be slightly larger than the other, smaller, outbuildings in the vicinity of the appeal site. This, combined with it being proportional to the host dwelling and the garden, ensures the shed appears congruent with the character of the area.

10. Overall, the outbuilding would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would therefore comply with Policies DH1, DH(a), DH3, and DH(h) of the Core Strategy[1], which together require development to provide a positive relationship with the existing urban context, for residential additions to be appropriate in scale, and to preserve heritage assets, with particular regard to the character and appearance of conservation areas. It would also conform with Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which together outline how development proposals should enhance local context, and in particular conserve the significance of heritage assets.

11. The development would also follow the aims of the CA Management Strategy[2], which looks to protect the character of the area. The proposal would accord

[1] Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted 2014)
[2] Plumstead Common Conservation Area Management Strategy (adopted 2010)

with the SPD[3], which outlines how outbuildings should be in proportion to the original house and garden.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR

[3] Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (adopted 2018)