



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3257585

8 Sudbury Crescent, Wembley HA0 2LZ

- 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 Sadeghian against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/1396, dated 13 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion from single dwellinghouse to two self contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development in terms of the provision of family housing; and
 - Whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with specific regard to internal space.

Reasons

Provision of family housing

4. The appeal property is a two storey end terraced dwelling on the edge of Sudbury Town Centre. The property has been extended in the form of ground and first floor rear extensions and a dormer window.
5. Policy DMP17 of the Development Management Policies (2016) (DMP) sets out circumstances where the conversion of family sized houses into two or more

dwellings will be supported. It makes clear in criterion b that proposals should result in at least a 3-bedroom dwelling preferably with direct access to amenity space.

6. The supporting text to Policy DMP17 explains that, whilst the conversion of existing housing stock into smaller dwellings provides additional homes, the continued provision of family-sized housing or flats of 3 bedrooms or more is also a priority because of the recognised need for such dwellings.
7. The scheme proposes a 1-bedroom flat at ground floor and a 1-bedroom flat split over the first floor and within the roof. Whilst the proposed development would have sizable kitchen/dining and living spaces it would not be capable of occupation by families due to the number of bedrooms proposed. It would lead to the loss of a family sized dwelling resulting in a detrimental impact upon the Council's family housing stock.
8. I note the appellant's comments that the proposed development would be a high quality design and would deliver housing for young professionals. Whilst this may well be a benefit of the scheme it would not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Furthermore, there is no evidence before me to indicate a pressing need for such accommodation in the area.
9. The appellant has made reference to a permission for the conversion of a dwelling into flats in the area and the existence of flat conversions in Sudbury Crescent. However, I am not aware of the individual circumstances behind these conversions. In any event every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done. The presence of other flat conversions in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with DMP Policies DMP16 and DMP17 and Policy CP21 of the Core Strategy (2010) which, amongst other things, seek to maintain family sized housing and a balanced housing stock to meet the wide range of household needs in the borough.

Living conditions for future occupiers

11. The Technical housing standards – Nationally Described Space Standards sets out a requirement for a minimum ceiling height of 2.3m for at least 75% of the gross internal area.
12. Notwithstanding the disagreement between the parties in respect of the ceiling height in Flat B, based on the evidence before me and my observations during the site visit the proposed ceiling height would be acceptable and would not result in cramped or substandard living conditions in this flat.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would provide future occupiers with acceptable living conditions with regard to internal space. It would accord with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Technical housing standards – Nationally Described Space Standards and DMP Policy DMP18 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that housing developments meet minimum space standards and are of the highest quality internally.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR