

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3157691

43 Baron Gardens, Ilford IG61NX

- 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 K Savjani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2239/16, dated 11 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'conversion of property into 2 No. self-contained flat units'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether the appeal proposal would adversely affect the provision of houses in single occupation in the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a three bedroom, terraced house laid out on three floors. It is currently laid out as a single family dwelling. No evidence is before to demonstrate that it is not a single family occupied dwelling house. In any event, it includes well laid out and proportioned internal space, a rear garden and a large outbuilding, such that I consider it would provide suitable family accommodation. No evidence to the contrary is before me.
 4. The appeal proposal falls for consideration under Policy H2 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008) (PP). That policy aims to provide a range of appropriate housing types and sizes, taking account of the location of the proposed development. In particular, point 2 specifies that the conversion of single family occupied houses into smaller units will only be permitted where it is located within a Metropolitan or District Centre or where the surrounding area comprises predominantly converted properties.
 5. The appeal proposal, by subdividing the appeal dwelling into two separate residential units, would result in the loss of a house suitable for single family occupation. It is undisputed in the evidence before me that the appeal dwelling is located outside a Metropolitan or District Centre. Further, in the locality single family houses dominate. In these circumstances, it would fail to accord with that policy in reducing the supply of houses suitable for family
-

accommodation. I will now assess whether other material considerations exist to outweigh that Development Plan conflict.

6. In this regard, I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would provide an additional unit of accommodation suitable for young single people, close to public transport, local facilities and services. However, the dwellings proposed would be small, resulting in a one bedroom dwelling and a studio unit. No evidence of an identified need for that size of unit is before me. This reduces the benefit of the appeal proposal and does not overcome the harm that I have identified.
7. I conclude that the appeal proposal would adversely affect the provision of family housing in the area. It would therefore be contrary to PP Policy H2.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR