



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 December 2024

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3345591

33 Bostall Hill, Greenwich, Abbey Wood, London SE2 0RB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Maple Property Group against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/0528/F.
 - The development proposed is change of use of part single family dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) and part ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E) to six-bedroom small HMO with a maximum capacity of six persons (Use Class C4) together with rear dormer and alterations to the rear elevation and associated cycle and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of part single family dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) and part ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E) to six-bedroom small HMO with a maximum capacity of six persons (Use Class C4) together with rear dormer and alterations to the rear elevation and associated cycle and refuse storage at 33 Bostall Hill, Greenwich, Abbey Wood, London SE2 0RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0528/F, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 33 Bostall Hill is a 2-storey terraced dwelling situated within a street scene of similar properties which incorporate bay windows and ornate archway features to the front elevation. Whilst the appeal property has commercial signage and a security grill to the front elevation, it nonetheless retains a similar form to other properties in the row and makes a positive contribution to the ordered character and appearance of the area. Some of the properties within the row have undergone rear extensions and alterations. Given this the contribution of the appeal property and surrounding properties to the character and appearance of the area appears to be limited to the form and frontage of the buildings, as opposed to the rear elevation.
4. The appeal proposal relates to the change of use of the property to a 6-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). To facilitate the conversion it is proposed to erect a dormer window in the rear roof slope. The dormer window would be constructed using appropriate materials and would be set in from the ridge and eaves of the roof slope and from the sides of the property.

Consequently, the original roof form would still be legible, and the dormer window would not appear unduly bulky or have the appearance of a 'top heavy' extension. The proposed windows would reflect the position, form and scale of the existing windows. Moreover, there would be limited views of the extension from the street scene. Given this the proposal would not appear visually obtrusive or incongruous in this context.

5. In light of the above the appeal proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. I therefore find no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2023) or Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which collectively seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which responds to the existing character of a place. I find no conflict with the Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2023) which has similar aims and requires that dormer windows should be well spaced and positioned within the existing roof slope and reflect the position of the existing windows.

Conditions

6. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, on which the appellant has had the opportunity to comment. Where necessary I have made revisions to some of the conditions put to me to ensure that they meet the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance, without altering their fundamental aims.
7. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard 3 year time limit condition for implementation. In addition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans in the interest of certainty. In the interest of the character and appearance of the appeal property, a condition is necessary to control the external materials of the development.
8. A condition relating to the provision of cycle parking is required in order to support more sustainable living. As details of cycle parking are shown on the submitted plans, I have amended this condition so that it relates to the provision and retention of this facility. A condition relating to the provision of bin storage facilities is necessary to ensure the provision of this necessary residential facility.
9. In order to ensure that the HMO provides appropriate standards of accommodation it is necessary to impose a condition restricting occupancy to a maximum of 6 persons.
10. The Council suggest a condition that would remove permitted development rights that allow alterations to the appeal property. However, limited explanation has been provided on why this is necessary to make the appeal development acceptable in planning terms. Therefore, this condition has not been imposed.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1.) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 2.) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: EI001, P001 Rev B, P002 Rev B, P003 Rev B, P004 Rev B.
- 3.) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building. All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match the adjacent work unless otherwise stated on the approved drawings and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 4.) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the cycle parking facilities shown in plan P001 Rev B shall be made available and shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 5.) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the refuse storage scheme shown in plan P001 Rev B shall be made available and shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 6.) The HMO hereby permitted shall not be occupied by any more than 6 persons at any one time.