
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/25/3366514

Site at Rear of 2 and 2a Tennyson Road, Heaton Grange, Romford, RM3 7AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammad Shafique against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P1252.24.
 - The development proposed is conversion of detached garage into 1 bedroom dwelling for single occupancy with front extension, new pitch roof, off-street parking and rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed development would make satisfactory provision for parking, having regard to local parking standards and highway safety,
 - Whether it would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers with regard to internal space and privacy; and,
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Parking

3. The council has referred to minimum parking space dimensions set out in its Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and its Domestic Vehicle Dropped Kerb Policy. Neither of these relate precisely to the appeal proposal, which involves the creation of a new dwelling at a site with an existing dropped kerb. Nonetheless, these dimensions are identified in order that a vehicle can be parked safely off the public highway without overhanging any part of it and allow space for moving around a parked vehicle.
4. The front boundary of the site is angled relative to the front elevation of the building. The length of the proposed parking area would therefore vary across its width. The council have identified a minimum length of 4.4 metres on the proposed plan and this has not been disputed.
5. The submitted plans show an intention to park a car on site, and there is no mechanism provided that would secure a car-free development. The proposed parking bay would be shorter than the minimum depth sought for parking bays in

other developments in the borough. This would significantly limit the space around even a small vehicle. As a consequence, it is likely that cars parked on the forecourt would overhang the pavement. Any overhang would restrict pavement width in front of the appeal site thereby forcing people to pass around it or even into the road to avoid it.

6. This would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It would also conflict with Local Plan policies 10 and 24, which the council refers to in its reasoning in its delegated report. These require, amongst other things, that developments ensure good access and that proposals consider the location and layout of parking provision as an integral part of the design process.
7. The council referred to Policy T6 of the London Plan in its reason for refusal. This policy addresses parking provision, amongst other things, but does not specify minimum parking bay dimensions. It is therefore not determinative in my consideration of this appeal.

Living conditions

8. It would be for any future occupiers to determine the number of people living in the property, if this appeal were to be allowed. However, the submitted plans show a double bed in the bedroom, and the bedroom would be larger than the minimum floor area for a double bedroom set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan. This indicates that the property would be used as a 1 bed, 2 person unit, and there is no mechanism proposed that could limit occupation. Policy D6 further requires that such units provide a minimum of 50 square metres gross internal floor area. The council calculates that the dwelling would have an internal area of 38 square metres and this is not disputed. It would therefore fail to meet this requirement. This shortfall would result in cramped accommodation that would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers.
9. The proposed garden area would be overlooked from neighbouring properties, including direct overlooking from 2 Tennyson Road. The occupiers of the proposed dwelling would therefore have little privacy within the rear garden. However, such overlooking is not unusual in a suburban environment, and similar relationships exist elsewhere in the local area. On balance, the development would provide acceptable privacy for future occupiers.
10. The appeal proposal would nevertheless fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers due to the inadequate internal living space. It would therefore conflict with policy D6 of the London Plan. It would also conflict with policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan (the Local Plan), which amongst other things seeks to ensure a high quality living environment for residents of new developments.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal site is in a suburban area and the street scene in the vicinity comprises a mix of bungalows and two-storey buildings of varied sizes and styles. The proposed dwelling would be a bungalow on a modest plot but given the varied surrounding character it would appear proportionate in scale and not out of place in the street scene. While the plot would be shallower than neighbouring plots the appeal site is next to a road junction where plot depths are constrained by the

gardens of houses on Tennyson Road, as the appeal site in turn constrains the plot depths of 2 and 2a Tennyson Road.

12. On balance therefore the appeal proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with policies 7, 10 and 26 of the Local Plan which taken together seek to promote high quality design that respect and complement the distinctive qualities and character of the site and local area.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. The Framework identifies the government objective of significantly boosting the supply homes. The council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and its most recent Housing Delivery Test figures show that 61% of the required homes were delivered against the council's target. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is therefore engaged.
14. The appeal site is in a sustainable location and is a small site on which development could be delivered quickly. There would be short-term economic benefits from the construction of the house, and its occupation would deliver ongoing long-term economic benefits. Given the pressing need for new housing in the borough the benefits arising from the delivery of even a single dwelling on this windfall site therefore attract moderate weight in the overall balance.
15. Set against this the proposal would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, and the proposed parking arrangement would result in an unacceptable effect on highway safety. These harms would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the appeal proposal.
16. The appeal proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, to indicate that this decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR