



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2023

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/22/3307782

41 Hawarden Grove, Lambeth, London SE24 9DQ

- 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 YKG DESIGN LTD against the decision of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/01993/FUL, dated 31 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as “proposed conversion of x2 self-contained residential flats into a single 2 storey dwellinghouse; together with a single storey side extension.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the supply of housing in the area.

Reasons

3. Policy H3 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021) (LP) requires that existing self-contained C3 housing be safeguarded in accordance with London Plan policy. It goes on to set out an exception for the net loss of self-contained residential accommodation where there is an identified need for specialist accommodation. Policy H8 of the London Plan (2021) states that the loss of existing housing should be replaced by new housing at existing or higher densities with at least the equivalent level of overall floorspace. As such, there is a clear requirement to protect existing housing in the Borough.
4. 41 Hawarden Grove currently comprises a one bedroom C3 unit at ground floor and a three bedroom C3 unit a first and second floor. It is proposed to amalgamate the two flats and extend the property to create a single C3 dwelling.
5. There would be a net loss of a single dwelling, and whilst the floorspace of the proposed single dwelling would be increased, the proposal would not result in new housing at existing or higher densities. This reduction in density along with the numerical loss of a dwelling would be contrary to LP policy H3 and London Plan policy H8. Additionally, as a single C3 dwelling, the proposed development would not meet the exception set out in LP policy H3. Consequently, the proposal would be harmful to the supply of houses in the area.

6. The appellant asserts that there are a number of benefits in favour of proposed development, including but not limited to, acceptable internal amenity space, large private amenity space and no impact on neighbouring properties. Whilst I have had regard to the appellant's submission, these factors appear to denote a lack of harm rather than any benefits, as such I can only afford them limited weight. In any event, they do not overcome the harm to the supply of housing identified above.
7. The appellant has made reference to developments in other London Boroughs, however I have not been provided with detailed information relating to these. Nevertheless, these appear to relate to policies on floorspace for family housing and limits on the amalgamation of dwellings in other Boroughs. Therefore, there is no material consideration that would outweigh policy H3 which has been subject to a rigorous Local Plan Examination.
8. The proposed development would be contrary to LP Policy H3 and London Plan Policy H8 which seek, amongst other things, to safeguard the existing self-contained C3 housing. The proposed development would also be contrary to paragraph 60 of the Framework which seeks to boost the supply of housing.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, there are no relevant material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, that would indicate a decision otherwise in accordance with the development plan. It is for this reason that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR