



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2022

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/22/3296840

286-288 Malyons Road, Ladywell, London SE13 7XF

- 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 Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref: DC/22/125048 dated 10 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is Conversion from 2 separate flats into 1 dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the provision of housing within the Borough.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is at the southern end of a terrace of residential properties on the west side of Malyons Road and in a predominantly residential area with the public open space of Ladywell Fields to the south. The road contains a mix of houses and flats, including properties built as flats with separate entrances from the street. From the information before me, it has been confirmed that the appeal property was built as two flats. It is, as existing, laid out as a one bedroom flat on the ground floor, with garden access, and a separate two bedroom flat above.
4. The proposal would convert the whole property, including some minor alterations, into one family sized dwelling with four bedrooms. There are no concerns with the standard of accommodation that would be provided and a family sized house would be created, but it would result in the net loss of one dwelling.
5. Core Strategy Policy 1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy 2011 relates to Housing provision, mix and affordability and criterion 2 is clear that development should result in no net loss of housing. Policy DM Policy 2 of the Council's adopted Local Plan 2014 (DM Local Plan) seeks to prevent the loss of existing housing and the proposal would not meet any of the circumstances set out under Section 1. Given that there is no evidence before me to suggest that it was once a single dwelling which has subsequently been converted to

multiple dwellings, Section 2 would also not apply. The supporting text to both policies indicates the overwhelming housing need within Lewisham and the Council has again confirmed the housing need within the Borough, which they have again described as *overwhelming*.

6. The proposal would not result in any loss of floorspace and would offer potential occupancy levels equivalent to or in excess of the existing two flats as required by Policy H8 of the London Plan 2021. Although the London Plan is a more recent plan to the Lewisham Core Strategy and DM Local Plan, I am satisfied that full weight should be given to the relevant policies from the Lewisham Plans which set out, on a more specific local basis, the way in which the housing supply is to be managed.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal, which would result in the net loss of one housing unit, would harm the provision of housing within the Borough. This would conflict with Policy 1 of the Council's Core Strategy and DM Policy 2 of the Council's DM Local Plan as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 5, all of which amongst other things seek to ensure the supply of housing.
8. The reason for refusal also refers to Policy GG4 of the London Plan 2021, and although this has not been provided to me, I understand that this, amongst other objectives, refers to a pressing need for more homes in London. The loss of a housing unit would not appear to meet that policy objective.
9. I have no doubt that there is a need for more family units and that the provision of a family unit would therefore offer some public benefits. However, there is no information before me to indicate that the provision of family sized units should be at the expense of the overall number of housing units. The proposal would not therefore outweigh the harm I have concluded, arising from the net loss of one residential unit.
10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR