



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3246527

58 Chadwell Heath Lane, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 4LP

- 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 Ikraam Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4365/19, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
 - The development is Proposed first floor rear extension & conversion of property into two self contained units with provision for car parking, cycle & refuse storage. Materials to be used on extension are to match existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the supply of family accommodation in the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the corner with Chadwell Heath Lane and Hall Road. The rear extension was erected at the time of my visit and this extension raises no objections by the Council. I can find no reason to disagree with the Council's view.
4. The proposal is to convert the single dwelling into two units both of two beds. With regards to the conversion of family dwellings into smaller units, the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) Policy LP6 permits the conversion of single family occupied dwelling houses into smaller units provided that the dwelling meets a number of criteria.
5. With regard to this appeal, only Policy LP6 criteria's (a) It is located in a Metropolitan or District Centre or Local Centre; and (f) The conversion provides at least one larger family sized home of 74 s.qm (3 bed plus) on the ground floor with access to a dedicated rear garden of the converted home, are in dispute by the parties.
6. With regards to Policy LP6 (a), the proposal is not located in either of these designated areas. It is therefore in conflict with this part of the policy requirement.

7. Turning to criteria (f), despite the fact that the internal floor areas would meet the required floor size in accordance with the policy, and the sizes contained within the Nationally Described Space Standards, the development would not provide a three bed unit on the ground floor. On this basis, the proposal would not meet this part of the policy. Whilst the appellant considers a two bed unit to be family accommodation, I apply significant weight to the fact that the proposal would not provide a three bed home on the ground floor.
8. The appellant is of the view that the proposal leads to sustainable development as per the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, together with the evidence cited by the Council of the Boroughs Housing Requirements Study, the Local Plan Policy LP6 supports the need for the existing type of housing in this location, and not for two bed flats, despite the fact the appellant considers a two bed unit would cater for family accommodation. Therefore with regards to creating two-bedroom dwellings in this location, this is not considered to be sustainable development.
9. Therefore, the proposal would not comply with all of LP Policy LP6, or Policy LP5 relating to securing a range of housing that contributes to a mixed, inclusive and sustainable community to which this proposal would not meet those objectives. However, the aims of Policy LP26 is to promote high quality design and I find no reason to suggest that the proposed development does not meet this policy.

Other Matters

10. I have taken account of the fact the appeal site may be close to local shops, with public transport available to other modes of transport and shopping facilities, schools and health services, parking availability, and whilst these weigh in favour of the proposal, they are however only part of the overall planning balance of my considerations.
11. The appellant considers a 5 bedroom house is out of character with the area although their Design and Access Statement explains that 'the proposed development in terms of form, scale and materials will be similar characteristics to the adjacent properties on Chadwell Heath Lane to ensure continuity and to complement the character of the area'. I am not of the view that a 5 bed house is out of character with the area.
12. There may be other flats and HMO's in the locality although no evidence of these have been presented with the appeal, and the Council have detailed in their Statement of Case there is very limited planning history of flats and HMO's here.
13. Whilst an additional dwelling would contribute to housing stock in the area, it would not add a significant contribution and I apply limited weight to this slight increase. Whilst the appellant states that there is a demand for smaller units, this is not evidenced by them.
14. Despite the use of good design solutions, and the size of space that would be created including external space, which is not disputed by the Council, and could comply with LP Policy LP29, its limited effect on the character and appearance of the area, and the Framework's support of making effective use of land, none of these factors persuade me to allow the appeal.

15. I note issues regarding its effect on local residents is not raised as a concern by the Council and I have no reason to disagree with these findings.
16. The appellant refers to paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework although these refer to the historic environment and I can find no relevance to this appeal.

Conclusion

17. In the planning balance I have considered all matters before me and come to the view that the appeal should not be supported for the aforementioned reasons. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR