

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0126.26

WARD: St Albans **Date Received:** 2nd February 2026

ADDRESS: Post Office, 80 Brentwood Road
Romford

PROPOSAL: Retrospective Planning Permission for retention of the garage shutter

DRAWING NO(S): ARC/25/BRE80/PL32 Page: 01/04
ARC/25/BRE80/PL32 Page: 02/04
ARC/25/BRE80/PL32 Page: 03/04
ARC/25/BRE80/PL32 Page: 04/04
Planning Statement

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The subject site features a 2-storey mid-terrace building with commercial uses at ground floor and residential above. There is a newsagents and post office on the ground floor at present.

It is not a listed building, nor is located within a conservation area.

THE PROPOSAL

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the retention of the garage shutter.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

P1052.25	Single Storey Rear Extension (Retrospective) and Removal of Existing Garage Door to Create Carport Apprv with cons 10-12-2025
P0629.23	Demolition of Existing Garage and Single Storey Rear Extension (Part-Retrospective) Apprv with cons 30-08-2023
P0189.23	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing garage and conservatory (Part Retrospective) Apprv with cons 05-04-2023

P1965.22	Single storey rear extension to convenience store following demolition of existing garage and conservatory	Refuse	01-02-2023
P0147.05	New shop front and access to residential unit	Apprv with cons	22-03-2005
P0257.99	Loft conversion - dormer windows to rear roofslope	Apprv with cons	01-04-1999

REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Surrounding neighbouring occupiers, including ones which directly adjoin the application site, were consulted about this application. No representations were received.

The following responses were also received by the stakeholders consulted below:

* LBH Highways - Concerned about lack of onsite parking space. The garage shown is not suitable to fit a car therefore this will cause parking overspill. Applicant should demonstrate the loss of parking space with parking stress survey.

PLANNING POLICIES

* NPPF

* London Plan 2021

- Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D4 - Delivering good design
- Policy T6 - Car parking

* Havering Council Local Plan (2016-31):

- Policy 7 (Residential design and amenity)
- Policy 23 (Transport Connections)
- Policy 24 (Parking provision and design)
- Policy 26 (Urban Design)

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

OFFICER APPRAISAL

In accordance with the Council's current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not

undertaken as one was not judged to be necessary. Site photographs were submitted in support of this application. In determining this planning application, photographs, Google Street View, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site's constraints.

The application site is currently the subject of an enforcement investigation (reference: ENF/114/23).

Planning permission was granted for a Single Storey Rear Extension (Retrospective) and Removal of Existing Garage Door to Create Carport under P1052.25.

Under P1052.25, consent was granted for the existing garage shutter to be removed in order for the area to be used as a car port and a condition was imposed requiring the garage door to be removed within one month of the date of that decision.

However, site photographs received of the rear of the site show that the garage door has not been removed and thus this application seeks consent to retain the shutter.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

It is not considered the retention of the garage shutter has a harmful impact on the locality.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

It is not considered the retention of the garage shutter has a harmful impact on neighbouring amenity.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The site is located within a PTAL of 4 and benefits from a garage with a shutter. The garage was previously detached from the main building but is now attached to it by virtue of being joined to its rear extension.

It is noted that the submitted planning statement argues that parking functionality would be unaffected by the retention of the garage shutter, that the space would remain fully capable of accommodating a vehicle and thus would maintain the intent of the previous approval (reference: P1052.25). Officers disagree with this view however.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the space would be capable of accommodating a vehicle when the garage shutter remains open, a vehicle would not be capable of parking within the space were it to be closed. As such, the requirement of the shutter to remain open for a vehicle to utilise the space is deemed to be a contrived arrangement that seeks to resolve the underlying issue that the space cannot accommodate a car at all times unless it functions as a car port without the shutter.

The arrangement proposed would not only be difficult to enforce and monitor but would also negate the use of the space as a garage when the shutter is closed. To that end, whilst the site photographs received during the application process show that the space is currently empty, it has

been previously used as a for storage (as illustrated in site photographs taken during a site visit for P0629.23 on 06/07/2023). Therefore, there can be no certainty that the space would not be used for storage when the shutter is closed. As the space would be incapable of accommodating a vehicle without the shutter being open, officers consider it would be unreasonable to impose a condition requiring the space to be used only as a garage and for no other purpose.

The parking arrangement proposed as part of the submission was also originally submitted for P1052.25. However officers identified the issues stated above as part of that application and so requested that the garage door be removed to facilitate the creation of a car port. Therefore, the arrangement shown would not maintain the intent of the previous approval.

The Council's Highways department objected to the application on the grounds of parking overspill because the garage shown as part of the submission is not large enough to fit a car and in the absence of any compelling evidence, such as a parking stress survey or otherwise, officers share these concerns.

It is considered the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal would not conflict with Policy 24 of the Local Plan; it is considered the retention of the garage shutter would contribute unacceptably to existing levels of parking stress and limited on-street spaces within the locality something which would be to the detriment of the amenity of surrounding occupiers.

OTHER ISSUES

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

From 2 April 2024 Biodiversity Net Gain became mandatory for small-sites through changes to Section 90 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).

As this application seeks consent to retain the garage door in-situ and does not propose a development that would impact any habitat within the site, it is considered it is considered to be exempt from BNG requirements.

CONCLUSION

The retention of the garage shutter is considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policies and guidance.

A REFUSAL is therefore recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the following reason(s)

1 Refusal non standard

In the absence of any compelling evidence otherwise, such as a parking stress survey, it is considered the retention of the garage shutter would contribute unacceptably to existing levels

of parking stress and limited on-street spaces within the locality because the space would be unable to accommodate a vehicle without the shutter being left open, something which would be prejudicial to highways flow and pedestrian safety and thus detrimental to the amenity of surrounding occupiers, contrary to Policy T6.3 of the London Plan.

INFORMATIVES

1 Refusal - No negotiation ENTER DETAILS

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal and the reason for it was given to the agent on 22/04/2026.

Authorising Officer:



Raphael Adenegan 22nd April 2026