
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2018

by H Miles BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3180417

19 Rowdowns Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM9 6NJ

- 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 Martin Overare against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 15/01607/FUL, dated 16 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations to external appearance in connection with subdivision to provide one 1 bedroom house and one 2 bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was amended post submission, and therefore the description on the planning application form is no longer accurate. The description of development above is taken from the appellant's appeal form and the Council's decision notice. I consider this is a clear description of the development before me, and this appeal has been considered on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would have a harmful effect on the supply of family sized housing in the Borough.

Reasons

Housing

4. Policy BC4 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 seeks to preserve and increase the stock of family housing in the borough by, in part, resisting the loss of housing with three bedrooms or more. I observed at my site visit that the appeal property is a family sized house. The submitted drawings show that the appeal proposal would provide an additional property but would not reinstate a 3 bedroom dwelling.
5. The appellant has referred to a need for smaller dwellings in this area, including the need for affordable housing and housing for first time buyers. However I have been provided with no substantive evidence to lead me to the view that this matter would outweigh the identified need to retain family housing in the area. Nor is it clear how the size of the existing nearby

properties reduces the need to retain this family sized home. Therefore I am unable to give these points a significant amount of weight.

6. The property is currently a single dwelling house and appears to be successfully occupied as such. The plans show that it has a single front door, one kitchen, one bathroom and living areas shared by the whole house. The fact that it has two internal staircases, does not lead me to conclude that the property would work better as separate units.
7. I note that points relating to external appearance, parking provision, garden and amenity space and internal room sizes within the proposed dwellings are not in dispute between the main parties. However, the absence of harm in these regards does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
8. The appellant refers to a similar scheme at 22 Rowdowns Road, opposite the appeal site. However, the details of this case are not before me. As such, this appeal has been considered on its own merits.
9. In conclusion, there are no significant material considerations in this case which would convince me to depart from the development plan. On this basis the appeal should fail as it would not preserve or increase the stock of family sized housing in the Borough and in this respect it would be contrary to Policy BC4 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, this appeal is dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR