



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2014

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 August 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/14/2218700 **107 King's Cross Road, London WC1X 9LR**

- 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 H Guzel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2013/7718/P was refused by notice dated 9 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is to convert floors two and three to two, one bedroom self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the mix of housing.

Reasons

3. Permission was granted in 2013 for the conversion of this former three bedroom property into two units, a one bedroom and a two bedroom. This proposal would result in the two bedroom unit being subdivided into two one bedroom flats. Much of the work has been completed. Policy DP5 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010 (CS) requires that developments contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities by securing a range of self-contained homes of different sizes.
 4. Section (a) of Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that all residential development, including the conversion of existing residential floor space, contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priority Table. The table identifies a lower requirement for one bedroom market properties and a very high requirement for those with 2 bedrooms. There is a medium requirement for three bedroom properties.
 5. The Council accepted the loss of the larger three bedroom unit (in medium need). That proposal resulted in a two bed property (in very high need) and an additional one bedroom flat. This proposal would result in the loss of the two bed dwelling and result in two, one bedroom properties (which have a lower need). The supporting text advises that the Council will seek to minimise the loss of dwelling sizes that are given a priority of medium or above and
-

developments should generally retain, or re-provide, existing two bedroom homes. The proposal is clearly at odds with the objectives and requirements of Policy DP5.

6. The appellant is of the view that given the need for additional housing and given the measures put in place by Government to allow conversions to residential use, such restrictive policies should not be applied. CS Policy CS6(k) supports the full use of Camden's capacity for housing but also seeks a range of self-contained homes of different sizes. I find the Council's policies to be consistent with the aspirations of the *National Planning Policy Framework* with regard to achieving mixed communities.
7. The appellant considers that the location of the property, on a busy and noisy main road in the heart of the main traffic interchange, would not be conducive to family use. Whilst such a central position may be more suited to certain households, the accommodation as originally accepted would not be unsatisfactory, substandard or ill-suited to future residents.
8. I do not find the appellant's views on the location or nature of the originally permitted accommodation to represent a good reason to depart from the clear policy position of the Core Strategy, particularly as it is consistent with the *Framework*.
9. A legal agreement has been completed which would prevent future occupiers from obtaining a parking permit. This requirement accords with the objective of Policy DP18 and I am satisfied that it overcomes the Council's concerns in that regard. It also ensures that the proposal would support the use of sustainable transport. Whilst this is a benefit of the proposal, I understand that the previous permission included a similar agreement.
10. The proposal would result in the addition of an extra unit of accommodation in this highly sustainable location. It would support sustainable transport choices and it would have no significant impact on the character or appearance of the area. However, it would clearly result in the loss of a property in highest need and it would be contrary to the development plan policies and the *Framework* in this regard. I have found there to be no convincing reason to accept development that would clearly be contrary to these policies. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR