



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2024

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/23/3327207

115 Elgin Road, Seven Kings, Redbridge, Ilford IG3 8LW

- 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 Nimal Singh of Tendercare Management Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1128/23.
 - The development proposed is Flexible and Dual use as current HMO (UCO C4) and Residential Institution Childrens care home (UCO C2).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether there is a demonstrable need within the borough for a children's care home.

Reasons

3. Amongst other matters, Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (RLP) Policy LP4 requires development for specialist accommodation, which would include a children's care home, to meet a demonstrable need within the borough and for it to be targeted at borough residents. Whilst the parties are in agreement that there is a shortage of safe and secure accommodation for children nationally, this is not the case in Redbridge, with the Council's Operational Director Children and Families indicating that Redbridge has the highest number of children's homes in London and that there is not a need for further provision. The appellant has not disputed either of these points, and the examples of referrals for their service come from outside the borough.
4. There is no substantive evidence before me as to why those authorities that make referrals to the appellant's company are hindered in their ability to accommodate those referrals such that it would be appropriate for provision to be made within Redbridge.
5. I have been provided with a copy of the management plan for a house in multiple occupation (HMO). However, this does not refer to the potential for the mixed use of the property as a HMO and a children's care home. Consequently, it does not support the proposed development.
6. It may be that planning permission is required as part of the registration process for other regulatory regimes. However, this would not be a reason to

allow the appeal when the proposed development would be contrary to the clear requirements of the development plan.

7. It has therefore not been demonstrated that there is a need within the borough for a children's care home. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to RLP Policy LP4 which requires proposals for specialist accommodation to demonstrate there is a need for the proposal and that it would be targeted at borough residents.

Conclusion

8. The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to suggest the decision should be made otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Downs

INSPECTOR