

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2016

**by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 9 March 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T1410/W/15/3138241**  
**41 Pevensey Road, Eastbourne BN21 3HR**

- 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 Tony Watson, Boringwheel Ltd against the decision of Eastbourne Borough Council.
  - The application Ref PC/150759, dated 21 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 01 October 2015.
  - The development is described on the application form as conversion of a previously approved 2-bedroom ground floor flat into 1 no.1 bedroom flat and 1 no.2 bedroom flat including new single storey ground floor rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. I understand that following the submission of the application but prior to its determination by the Council, amended plans were submitted revising the proposal to create two 1 bedroom flats. This is reflected in the description used in both the appeal form and decision notice. I have consequently considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The single storey rear extension has already been constructed along with internal conversion works, though at my site visit I observed that the conversion works carried out to Flat 2 are different to those shown in the final application drawings in respect of the omission of one of the internal walls. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered this appeal on the basis of the drawings as considered by the Council and submitted with this appeal.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development provides satisfactory living accommodation for residents.

## Reasons

5. The Council is concerned that the proposed flats would provide substandard accommodation due to their small size. Policy B2 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy seeks, amongst other things, to provide appropriate residential amenity for existing and future residents. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
-

6. From the information provided, Flat 1 measures 33 square metres whilst Flat 2 measures 38 square metres. The Council says that these sizes are below the 50 square metres standard of the *Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards*, though it acknowledges that the Council has no adopted policy in relation to the size of residential accommodation. I have consequently considered the appeal scheme on its merits in terms of the overall quality of the residential accommodation provided.
7. Flat 1 has a reasonably sized living area though this also serves as a kitchen and dining area and as such it is limited in the space provided. The bedroom is also of limited size. The appellant says that the flats would be more suitable for young single professionals who are the traditional occupants of accommodation in multiple occupation houses. With this in mind, I find whilst being small in size, Flat 1 would on balance provide satisfactory residential accommodation for a single person, though would be less suitable for occupation by two people.
8. Based on the appeal drawings, Flat 2, whilst larger in its total floor area, would be subdivided in to more rooms than Flat 1. The kitchen/dining room provides for an adequate space. However, the separate lounge would be particularly small for either its intended purpose or, whilst this is not shown in the appeal drawings, if it were to be used as a bedroom at any future point. The separate bedroom is also of a restricted size. Given the limited sizes of the rooms, most particularly the lounge and bedroom, I consider that Flat 2 does not provide sufficient space for the rooms proposed resulting in an unsatisfactory standard of residential accommodation for occupiers. Even if this flat was to be occupied by a single person the space provided would be very limited due to the room sizes.
9. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the appeal scheme would not provide for a satisfactory form of residential accommodation, contrary to policy B2 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy and the Framework.
10. I acknowledge the high proportion of single household accommodation and the younger age profile of the neighbourhood along with the recognition that conversions and changes of use of existing buildings can make a useful contribution to the overall delivery of residential development in Eastbourne. Different households have different needs for accommodation requiring a variety of different sizes and forms of residential unit. However, the design and layout of such provision is still required to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation which I do not consider to be the case in this instance.
11. Located at the rear of the site, the single storey extension is not prominently located and it is rendered to match the existing building. Taking account of other extensions to other properties in the vicinity of the site, I am satisfied that it maintains the character and appearance of the Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area.
12. For the above reasons, having had regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Cliff*

INSPECTOR