



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3252321

282 Chadwell Heath Lane, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 4YL

- 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 Wayne Babb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3582/19, dated 4 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is for 2 self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (a) the supply of family housing in the Borough; (b) the living conditions of future occupants of the development with regard to the layout of the internal accommodation and provision of outdoor amenity space; and (c) the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties with regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Family housing

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, 2-storey dwelling located on the junction of Chadwell Heath Road and Tendring Way. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature with Grove Primary School on the opposite side of Chadwell Heath Road.
4. Policy LP6 of the Redbridge Local Plan March 2018 (LP) states that the Council will only support the conversion of a larger home into smaller self-contained units dependent on a number of criteria. Amongst other things, the site should be located in a Metropolitan, District or Local Centre.
5. The appeal site is not located in any of these centres. I note that areas outside of these centres are more appropriate to family living and the provision of larger homes. The loss of existing family-size housing can be difficult to offset through the provision of family size housing in new development, as this new development will predominantly be located in town centres. The site lies in an established residential area where the Council wishes to protect dwellings for family occupation at lower densities as part of its strategy to provide a range of house types to meet the Borough's housing needs.

6. Consequently, I find that the appeal proposal would result in harm to the supply of family housing within the Borough. This would materially conflict with LP Policies LP5 and LP6 which seeks to secure a range of homes that will contribute to the creation of mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities and control the conversion of larger homes into smaller self-contained units.

Living conditions

7. The Council is concerned that the gross floor area of the ground floor flat does not meet the size requirement set out at policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2016 and the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard March 2015. The requirement outlines that a 3-bed, 6-person unit should have a minimum Gross Internal Area of 95 square metres; in this instance the flat would be 93.7 square metres.
8. The size requirements for residential units are intended to act as a benchmark for high design quality. In my view, any shortfall is unlikely to be appropriate and the proposal therefore conflicts with the standards in principle. Whilst I note that the size of the individual bedrooms would be compliant, the overall scale of the communal areas would result in a cramped and oppressive environment for future occupants.
9. The proposed layout plan shows that the outdoor amenity space serving the development would essentially comprise of car parking spaces, with no dedicated garden area. Whilst this would technically result in conflict with LP policy, taking a judicious approach I agree with the Council that such matters could be the subject of a condition had the appeal been allowed. This would also resolve the Authority's concerns in respect of the number of parking spaces proposed.
10. Although there would be no harm to the living conditions of future occupants of the development with regard to the provision of outdoor amenity space, the layout of the internal accommodation of the ground floor flat would result in detriment. The appeal scheme would be contrary to policies LP26 and LP29 of the LP which require high quality accommodation and compliance with internal space standards.

Noise and disturbance

11. The Council is concerned that the proposed sub-division of this family dwelling would result in a loss of amenity and character to the area through increased noise and disturbance.
12. I am not persuaded that this would be the case. I note the relatively small scale of the proposal and its location on a junction and opposite a primary school. There is no evidence before me to suggest that noise from the occupiers of the development would increase during unsociable hours or that there have been any anti-social issues in the locality. Of course such occurrences may happen sometimes, but that would be the case for any number of properties in the area. The number of vehicular movements for the purposes of day-to-day living would be more or less similar to a large family dwelling, and as outlined above the layout of parking spaces could be the subject of a condition to minimise any effects in this regard. Overall on this matter, I consider that the Council's concerns are unfounded and no demonstrable harm would arise.

13. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings with regard to noise and disturbance. There would be no conflict with policy LP26 of the LP which seeks to ensure that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

14. Based on the foregoing, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR