
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/23/3335560

Land adjacent to 1 Abbey Crescent, Belvedere DA17 5AX

- 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 Ms Dorilyn Penfold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application reference is 23/00086/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a single 2 storey 2 bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupants with regard to internal space provision.

Reasons

3. The proposed floor plans show a two-storey property with a bedroom/study, bathroom, kitchen and living area on the ground floor, and bedroom and en suite on the upper level. The Council is concerned that the development would result in cramped living accommodation, demonstrating a significant shortfall when compared to the standards outlined in Policy D6 of the London Plan (LP). There would be no space for internal storage, and the Local Authority states that the unit would have sub-standard ceiling heights.
4. Given that the London Plan figures are minimum standards which are intended to act as a benchmark for high design quality, in my view any shortfall is unlikely to be appropriate and the proposal therefore conflicts with the standards in principle. In the absence of any robust evidence from the appellant, for example in the form of section plans, I am unable to ascertain whether the proposal would meet the required ceiling height. Taken together with the lack of storage and limited internal accommodation overall, I consider that the internal layout of the scheme would result in a constricted environment for future occupants.
5. I appreciate that the external appearance of the building would be appropriate to its context; that sunlight, external amenity space, landscaping, drainage and parking provision would be acceptable; and there would be no adverse harm to the living conditions of local residents. Also that this is a site in close proximity to excellent local shopping facilities and public transport modes. However, these arguments do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

6. I therefore conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the living conditions of future occupants with regard to internal space provision. This would be contrary to Policy D6 of the LP, which seeks to ensure that new residential development are of a high standard of design and layout to meet the functional requirements of future residents.

Conclusion

7. Given the above and all other issues, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR