



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/19/3241034

1 Abingdon Road, Norbury, London SW16 5QP

- 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 Chang Jin Huang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/00491/FUL, dated 25 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of a single family dwelling house into 3no self-contained units (2x1 bed units, 1x3 bed unit).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development has been changed from the application form. This was agreed by the parties, and therefore no party has been prejudiced from that change.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of future residents having regard to the availability of internal floorspace and the amenity space available.

Reasons

4. The dwelling subject to the appeal is located within a predominately residential area and forms part of a terrace of properties.
5. The appeal proposal would see the dwelling converted to three flats. The Council have not raised any objection to the sizing of Flat 1 and Flat 3 (notated on the plans as F4) and therefore I will not consider those any further on the floor space issue.
6. The Council's objection relates to Flat 2. This flat is proposed to be a 3 bed, 5 person unit and is spread over two floors. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016) includes the Nationally Described Space Standards requires such dwellings to be at least 93sqm. Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (the LP) sets out the requirements for private amenity space.
7. I also noted that the bedroom located in the loft space would be affected by the restricted headroom which would further restrict the available floorspace that could be available. From the plans, it appears that the potential residents

would not have access to the private amenity space that accompanies the dwelling as a whole, I can see no indications of subdivision of that space that would demonstrate how each flat would meet the required levels of private amenity space.

8. Flat 2 is shown to have a floor space of 91sqm, just under the requirement set out in Policy 3.5, and would be further reduced by the height restriction to the bedroom, and this, in conjunction with the lack of evidence demonstrating the provision or allocation of private amenity space, would be harmful to the living conditions of future residents in relation to internal floor space and amenity space available. As a result, the appeal proposal would be contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and Policy DM10 of the LP, which amongst other matters, seek to ensure that housing is of the highest quality, and provides sufficient suitable private amenity space to support new dwellings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR