



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2026

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3338642

18 Trafalgar Grove, Greenwich SE10 9TB

- 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 Mr Ibikunle Awosanya of Greenford Care Home against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 22/3135/F.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'change of use from residential (class C3) to commercial guest house (class C1)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use from residential to a unit for holiday let at 18 Trafalgar Grove, Greenwich SE10 9TB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/3135/F, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale location plan; 220201-01A; 220201-02A; 220201-06A and 220201-08A.
 - 3) The property shall be occupied by no more than eight guests at any one time. An up-to-date register containing details of the names of all the occupiers of the accommodation, their main home addresses and their dates of arrival and departure from the accommodation shall be kept and made available for inspection by the local planning authority upon request.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development set out in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, it is clear from the submitted information that the proposal is for the change of use from residential to a unit for holiday let. The Council and appellant agreed to this change in description. I have determined the appeal on this basis and the decision in paragraph 1 above reflects this approach.
3. From the submissions, it appears that the property has previously been let out as holiday accommodation. For the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with the appeal based on the plans and information before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises an end-terraced house at the end of a narrow residential dead-end road adjacent to a sunken railway line. It has accommodation over three floors, with a living room at basement level and four double bedrooms on the two floors above. Only part of the appeal building adjoins the neighbouring maisonettes at Chaville Court with its large rear garden abutting the adjacent residences and their rear outdoor areas.
6. No internal or external alterations would be required for the proposed change of use of the property to a holiday let unit. The property could accommodate upto eight guests, a number which would be no different to a large family occupying it as a dwelling.
7. The appellant states that most people stay for 2-3 nights though some stay longer, with the average stay being around 4 nights. There would be cleaning vans between each stay. At my site visit, I noted the provision of three domestic bins for different types of waste and there is no substantive evidence that arrangements for the collection of waste would differ from the existing kerbside collection off Trafalgar Grove. Further, the Council's Highways Officer states that the proposal is not expected to generate any more trips than if used as a large family house. As such, the proposed use would not generate significantly more vehicular movements or disturbance compared to its existing use as a dwelling.
8. There is anecdotal evidence suggesting that neighbours have experienced noise and anti-social behaviour from parties when the site was in use as a holiday let. Indeed, the Council's Environmental Health Officer notes that the Council has previously received complaints from residents about noise. The proposed use would result in a higher turnover of occupiers than the existing house, but this does not mean that parties would be a direct consequence of the proposal. In any case, excessive levels of noise and disturbance arising from parties would need to be investigated and dealt with if necessary under the relevant powers outside the planning system.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. This would comply with Policy D14 of the London Plan 2021 (London Plan) and Policy E(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (CSDP). Amongst other things, these seek to resist proposals that would have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of adjacent occupiers, including in relation to noise.

Other Matters

10. The site is within the East Greenwich Conservation Area (CA) and the buffer zone of the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site (WHS). I have had regard to the duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. As no physical alterations are proposed and the proposed use

would not change the character of the area, the appeal scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and WHS.

11. Some interested parties raise issues relating to parking and congestion. The site does not have a dropped kerb or off-street car parking, though the evidence suggests that some unlawful parking off-street to the rear of the building and on-street, and damage from vehicles, has previously occurred. Nevertheless, it is not proposed to alter the arrangements on site and there is good access to public transport. Further, the Council's Highways Officer does not object to the scheme, and I have no reason to disagree.
12. Policies in the London Plan and CSDP support the provision of tourist accommodation, and the proposal would only result in the loss of a single dwelling. As such, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would cause a harmful loss of housing stock in the Borough.
13. Concerns have been raised about future occupiers being affected by railway noise due to the site's proximity to the railway line. However, the Council's Environmental Health Officer raises no concerns in this regard and no changes to the external or internal layout are proposed compared to the previous use of the property as a dwellinghouse.
14. There is reference to other planning applications for the site refused by the Council¹, but I have limited information on how these compare to the scheme currently before me.
15. Nearby residents query whether the proposal would meet internal space standards, but I have not been directed to any policies setting out any such requirements for holiday let accommodation.
16. An interested party considers that the planning application form includes an incorrect ownership declaration. However, there is no substantive evidence that the appellant is not the sole owner of the appeal site.

Conditions

17. I have had regard to the conditions suggested in the Council's statement and planning officer's report and considered them against the statutory tests outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
18. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty.
19. I have imposed a condition limiting occupation of the property to no more than eight guests to ensure satisfactory living conditions.
20. The Council's suggested condition relating to parking permits is not necessary as I have found that the occupation of the property as a holiday let would be no more intensive than its existing use as a house. As no off-street parking is proposed and the site has good access to services and public transport, a condition requiring a vehicle crossover is also unnecessary.

¹ Including planning application ref: 25/0232/HD and 25/4174/HD

21. Further, the suggested conditions restricting changes of use, the length of stays and the use to one short-term commercial let within use class C1² are not necessary. This is due to its existing residential use and the fact that the proposal is for a single holiday let rather than one of the uses in class C1.

Conclusion

22. I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh this finding. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR

² In the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)