Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2018

by N Smith BA (hons) MA MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/18/3203641
10 St. Erkenwald Road, Barking, IG11 7XA

- 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 Younis Garib against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
- The application Ref 16/01928/FUL, dated 08 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2017.
- The development proposed is change of use house C3 to house in multiple occupation (HMO) with 5 rooms.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would be acceptable, having regard to policy concerning the loss of family housing.

Reasons

3. The development would result in the loss of a house with three or more bedrooms, which BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document categorises as constituting a family house. The Council has provided persuasive evidence, based on the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment, of the strong need for family-sized accommodation in the Borough. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy BC4, which seeks to preserve and increase the stock of such housing and prevent its loss through conversion to flats or houses in multiple occupation.

4. The appellant describes that they have not been successful in renting the property as a family house, that the property cannot be managed or maintained as a single unit and that the proposed accommodation could help meet specific housing need. However, I have been given no specific, strong evidence, for example of prolonged unsuccessful attempts to rent the property as a family dwelling, which would support those concerns.

5. The property is well located for access to shops and transport connections but that would benefit occupiers living as a family in the same way that it would those living in a house in multiple occupation. There are flats near to the site and I have nothing before me to suggest that relevant standards for houses in multiple occupation would not be met by the development, but these factors to
do not outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan as a whole that I have identified.

**Conclusion**

6. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal should be dismissed.

N Smith
INSPECTOR