

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

**by Janet Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS**

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

**Decision date: 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/17/3172167**

**30 Browning Road, Manor Park, LONDON E12 6ES**

- 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 Shiraz Anwar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
  - The application Ref 16/03202/FUL, dated 10 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
  - The development proposed is conversion of existing storage/outbuilding into a studio dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of future residents and, if this would be harmful, whether it would be outweighed by the benefits of providing a further dwelling.

### Reasons

3. The development involves the extension of a single storey store attached to 30 Browning Road (No 30). The building would be extended to occupy the whole of the side yard of No 30. Whilst the space created at 39.1m<sup>2</sup> only just exceeds the minimum floor space required for a one person one bed unit, which requires 39.0m<sup>2</sup>, the wedge shape and configuration of the space would limit its usability and reduce the value of the space provided. The studio would have inconvenient access to the bin store and would also lack any private amenity space. These factors would create an unacceptably poor standard of accommodation.
  4. The studio would have some pavement space in front of it that could, in theory, be fenced off to create a small external space however the location of the building on a prominent corner of a busy main road would not provide adequate defensible or private space.
  5. The appellant asserts that the studio would make a positive contribution to the mix of housing in the area and meet the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which supports the provision of additional housing. He argues that the Council have a single reason for refusal which
-

- relates to one standard in the guidance and argues that failure to meet only one standard should not outweigh the benefits of the development.
6. Whilst the addition of the studio would make a very modest contribution to the housing stock in the Borough it would not provide a quality unit of housing when assessed against the development plan. The need to provide additional housing should not be at the expense of substandard accommodation. Minimum amenity space requirements exist to drive up standards and ensure that new housing contributes to the creation of healthier neighbourhoods. In this case the development would not meet all the minimum standards and the benefit outline would not outweigh these requirements.
  7. The appellant states that Policy SP2 is not applicable as it does not refer to shape layout and amenity space. Policy SP2 incorporates the improvement of housing quality and for the reasons given above I find that the proposal would be in conflict with this policy.
  8. The appellant also argues that the development is in compliance with other policies cited by the Council. Policy S1 focuses on wider strategic objectives but does prioritise family housing over smaller residential units and this development would be at odds with this as it would take space away from a larger unit. Policy S6, emphasises housing quality, Policy SP1 expects high quality development to improve the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to stay, Policy SP3 requires all development proposals to produce places that people feel proud of and Policy H1 requires the provision of private garden space in new development. A degree of conflict exists with elements of each of these policies as minimum standards are not met in full.
  9. For the above reasons the proposal would conflict with: Policies 3.3, 3.5, 3.8 and 7.1 of the London Plan; Policies S6, SP1, SP2, SP3 and H1 of the Core Strategy (2012); to Standard 26 of the SPG and to the Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the standard of new residential accommodation is of a high quality; meets minimum space standards for both internal and external space and promotes healthier neighbourhoods.

## **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal should be dismissed.

*Janet Wilson*

INSPECTOR