



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3250917

21 Chase Lane, Barkingside, Ilford, IG6 1BH

- 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 Nerijus Kazickas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4332/19, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is to subdivide single dwelling house to create 1 x 4 bedroom and 1 x 1 bedroom house, with associated car parking space, refuse, amenity space, and alter fenestrations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposed development i) would accord with the local spatial housing policies; ii) would make adequate provision for the living conditions of future occupiers has been made, having regard to the quantity of internal floorspace and external amenity space; and, iii) makes adequate provision for cycle parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey end of terraced dwelling set within a residential street and with front and rear gardens, the former of which is used for off-street car parking. Existing incomplete works to extend the property over two-storeys to the side were in evidence at the time of my visit.
4. In assessing the principle of development, the Council has cited Policy LP6 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, March 2018 (the Local Plan). This policy addresses Dwelling Conversions, Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Buildings in Multiple Residential Occupation and sets out various criteria and conditions whereby a conversion would be permitted.
5. The appeal property would not be located within a Metropolitan, District or Local Centre, but in a suburban residential location where the Council has identified through the Redbridge Housing Strategy 2017-2022 the need to protect dwellings for family occupation. Nevertheless, the conversion of the extended dwelling would continue to make provision for a residual family-sized dwelling calculated by the Council to still provide 130m² of floorspace, or sufficient to comfortably accord with the required minimum Gross Internal Area

- (GIA) for a 4-bed 7-person family-sized unit, with access to an area of rear garden.
6. Despite the above, the Government's Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard, March 2015, which Policy LP29 of the Local Plan requires accordance with, indicates that a 2 storey dwelling must be assessed at a minimum of a 1 bed 2 person (1b2p) unit, with a GIA of 58m². In this instance, whilst I accept that the provision of a bedroom of 11.45m² only marginally fails to accord with the 11.5m² standard for a double bedroom, the resultant 1b2p unit would only provide 43.15m² GIA, which would represent a substantial shortfall from the GIA required by the nationally described space standard and the Development Plan.
 7. I have had regard to the Council's assessment of the new property as a 2 bed 3 person dwelling in reaching their conclusions. However, this interpretation places a reliance on regarding an office/study room of 4.68m² as of adequate size to allow consideration as a single bedroom where the minimum accepted GIA would be 7.5m². The appellant has not provided any compelling evidence of an intention to provide the accommodation in this manner, and I have not therefore assessed the proposal on this basis.
 8. Turning to the provision of external amenity space, the proposed 1b2p unit would not meet the requirement for new housing development to provide 50m² of private amenity space for a 1 bed unit as required by Policy LP29. Whilst I note that the appellant has referred to a 28m² private rear garden as well as 15.25m² front driveway, providing a total of 43.25m², Part 2(d) of Policy LP29 explicitly discounts areas used for parking (such as driveways) from any such calculation of amenity space. Whilst a flexible approach may be justifiable in some circumstances, despite the proximity of public open space, I do not conclude that any compelling justification is applicable in this instance to allow such a substantial shortfall from the required amenity space standard.
 9. I have also carefully considered the Council's reference to the need to make provision for appropriate cycle parking provision in accordance with the standards as set out in The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011, March 2016 (The London Plan). However, the proposal makes no allowance for cycle parking, and whilst in certain circumstances a condition requiring future provision might suffice, in this instance given the limited available space on the driveway and the absence of an access to the rear garden without passing through the open plan kitchen/lounge, I share the Council's concern over the ability of the scheme to make such provision.
 10. I would accept that the proposed development would not result in any significant loss of character or amenity to the area as a result of increased traffic, noise or general disturbance, and would continue to provide a family-sized unit. However, the proposed development would conflict with the local spatial housing policies in this suburban location, would make inadequate provision for the living conditions of future occupiers, having regard to the quantity of internal floorspace and external amenity space, and would fail to provide cycle parking.
 11. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with Policies LP6, LP22, LP23, LP26, and LP29 of the Local Plan, as well as Policies 3.5 and 6.9 of The London Plan. In addition to addressing dwelling conversions and amenity and internal

space standards, these policies seek to promote high quality design in all development and sustainable transport including a reduction in car dependency, as well as ensuring the provision of sufficient cycle parking.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The appellant has advocated the provision of an additional unit of residential accommodation as amounting to a social benefit which must weigh in support of the proposed development. However, for the reasons set out, the proposed additional dwelling would represent a very poor quality of accommodation which would not meet the needs of future occupiers, and therefore I do not attach any significant weight to the proposal on this basis.
13. The appeal proposal would nevertheless make some additional provision for the local economy during the construction period and would have the potential to provide some limited benefit from any expenditure from future occupiers of the additional dwelling, which I would attribute some limited weight towards in support of the development.
14. However, I find that the development does not accord with the spatial housing policies of the Development Plan, fails to make adequate provision for the living conditions of future occupiers of the property, or address the need for cycle parking.
15. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the harm caused by the development would significantly outweigh any benefits, and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR