



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/21/3279806

21 Belgrave Road, Plaistow, London E13 8RT

- 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 P Weragama against the decision of London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 21/01040/FUL, dated 26 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'resubmission, conversion of dwelling into two separate dwellings (1x3bed, 1x1bed)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. During my site visit the property appeared to have been subdivided into two dwellings with some discrepancies between the built development and the proposed drawings. Since the council made their decision based on the existing and proposed drawings, I have determined the case based on the same and not the works which have been built on site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would accord with the Council's strategy for housing.

Reasons

4. Policy H4 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan 2018 (LP) states that the Council will specifically protect 3 bed and 4+ bed family housing. Notwithstanding this, the Policy states that the subdivision of 3+ bed housing maybe appropriate subject to number of criteria.
5. Since the property as shown on the 'as existing' plan, is not located above an existing occupied commercial unit, has access to external private amenity space, does not have a poorly defined entrance and is not located in a town centre, the development conflicts with this Policy.
6. The proposal would subdivide the property to a 3 bed and a 1 bed dwelling. While the larger dwelling would accommodate the same number of bedrooms as the existing dwelling, given the smaller room sizes, it would accommodate fewer occupants than the existing property. Therefore, the development would not accord with the Policy's aim to protect the Borough's existing stock, including overall floor space.

7. Consequently, the proposed development would not accord with the Council's strategy for housing. Therefore, it would conflict with LP Policies H1, H4, S1 and S6 which seek, among other things, a mix and balance of housing types, sizes and tenures and to protect family housing.
8. The proposal would also conflict with the aims of LP Policy SP1 which seeks to enhance the positive elements of the Borough, among other things.
9. Since LP Policy SP3 relates to urban design it is not directly relevant to this main issue.
10. The scheme would also conflict with Policy GG4 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For Greater London March 2021 (London Plan) which seeks to create mixed and inclusive communities among other things. It would also conflict with London Plan Policies H8 and H10 which require that the loss of existing housing should be replaced by new housing with at least the equivalent level of overall floorspace and seeks a range of unit sizes.

Other Matters

11. I note the evidence regarding marketing of the property, local housing supply, efficient use of sites and relevant development plan policies. I also acknowledge that there may not be harm with respect to the character and appearance of the area resulting from the alterations to the rear windows and with respect to neighbouring amenity. However, given the development plan conflict identified above, these matters have not altered my overall decision.
12. I note the comments of the Inspectors for the decisions noted by the Council. However, there is limited further information regarding these appeals and some appear to have been determined with regard to a different development plan such that I am unable to make a direct comparison with this case which must be assessed on its individual merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR