



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3262159

71 Fanshawe Crescent, Dagenham, London, RM9 5EL

- 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 Shefqet Zuqlli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/01706/FULL, dated 16 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'conversion of existing dwelling into 3bed and 2bed dwelling house and installation of window and doors'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the supply of larger, family dwellings in the Borough.
3. Relevant development plan policies include CM1 and CM2 in the Council's Core Strategy (CS) (2010) which seek to ensure that development meets community needs and maximises density taking into account local need and BP10 in the Borough-Wide DPD which encourages the optimum use of sites. They also include policies in the London Plan 2021 (which has replaced the London Plan 2016) which together aim to deliver the homes that London needs (GG4) by increasing housing supply (H1), supporting new homes on small sites that diversify the type and mix of housing (H2), seeking to ensure that the loss of existing housing is replaced by new housing at higher densities with at least the equivalent level of overall floorspace (H8), and refer to the need for additional family housing and to reduce pressure on the subdivision or conversion of properties (H10). Those policies have replaced those in the Intend to Publish London Plan referred to in the Council's decision but their provisions are essentially unchanged. These are evidenced policies which are supported by national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to not only make efficient use of land but to ensure that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community is reflected in policies. I have given little weight to the policies in the Council's Draft Local Plan given its emerging status.
4. The appeal site comprises an end terrace dwelling which has been extended to the side and rear at ground and first floor levels under permissions approved in recent years, the most recent of which increased the size of the three bedroom

dwelling to a five bedroom dwelling. The existing plans submitted with this application show the current layout at first floor as three bedrooms, two with en-suites and a third bathroom. I agree with the Council, however, that given its size and layout, the property has the potential to be a five bedroom dwelling and a larger, family home.

5. The proposed development includes internal and external alterations to provide a smaller three bedroom dwelling and a two bedroom dwelling. Although it would retain a family-sized unit of housing, this would be significantly smaller than the existing dwelling. No additional floorspace is proposed and the need for an additional set of stairs, hallway and landing in the two bedroom dwelling would reduce the overall floorspace of the living accommodation, contrary to London Plan policy H8.
6. The proposal would provide an additional unit of housing, would increase the density of the site and would widen the range of housing in the area, as sought by some of the development plan policies referred to above. However, it fails to take into account local need and those benefits would not outweigh the loss of a larger, family home. The Council says that those are in short supply in the Borough and I have no evidence that would lead me to disagree with that. As such it would be contrary to CS policies CM1 and CM2 and to DPD policy BP10. If allowed, the proposal would be likely to create a precedent for further pressure for the subdivision or conversion of properties which London Plan policy H10 seeks to discourage.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the supply of larger, family dwellings in the Borough, contrary to the development plan and to the Framework as a whole. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector