



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 3<sup>rd</sup> of April 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3354035**

**9 Cardinal Way, Rainham, Havering, RM13 9RB**

- 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 Adam Ward of Redward Group Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
  - The application Ref is P0947.24.
  - The development proposed is described as “Erection of a two-storey 3 bedroom dwelling to the side of existing house with new parking space to the rear. Existing integral garage and parking space to remain to serve the existing house.”
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area,
  - Whether it would provide an acceptable standard of internal accommodation for future occupiers; and,
  - The effect on on-street parking and whether it would make sufficient provision for off-street parking.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal site is a part of a corner plot in this residential street. Houses within the immediate setting are two storeys in height. There is a generally consistent scale of development within the street scene, with some minor variations in height and eaves levels between individual properties. The flank wall of No 9 is aligned with the front elevations of the houses to the rear of the appeal site.
4. Within this setting the proposed house would be consistent in scale with its surroundings. However, it would be an intrusive element in the street scene, breaking the established building line formed by the houses to the rear of the host property and by its flank wall.
5. The consistency in this building line is reinforced by development on the opposite side of the street where 26A and 26B have been built in line with their neighbouring houses. This development reinforces the established pattern of

development in the street, where the appeal proposal would be an incongruous element in the street scene. Its prominent location on a corner plot would make it highly visible on the approach from the junction along Bernwick Road. This would highlight its intrusiveness within the street scene.

6. The design and scale of the house would be sympathetic with the established character of the house and wider terrace. However, this would not be enough to offset the identified harm arising from its siting in this location.
7. The appeal proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the aims of policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (the Local Plan). Taken together these require that development be of a high design quality that respects, reinforces and complements the local street scene.

#### *Living conditions*

8. Policy D6 of the London Plan sets out minimum room sizes for residential development to ensure that development is fit for purpose and meets the needs of Londoners. Amongst other requirements, it states that single bedrooms must have a floor area of 7.5 square metres. The single bedroom shown on the submitted plans would have a floor area of 6.5 square metres.
9. The appellant notes that the room size has been increased from 6 square metres from a previous submission. Nevertheless, this is a shortfall on the required minimum space for a single bedroom. The shortfall would result in a cramped bedroom of poor quality, and substandard living conditions for the occupiers of the proposed house. As the submitted plans show the room as a bedroom, I have determined the appeal on that basis.
10. The proposed development would therefore fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It would conflict with the identified aims of policy D6 of the London Plan. It would also conflict with policy 7 of the Local Plan which, amongst other criteria, requires that the quality of life of future residents not be adversely impacted.

#### *Parking*

11. The appeal site is in an area of the borough with a public transport accessibility level of 1b. In such areas policy 24 of the Local Plan states that a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces must be provided for 3 bedroom houses. This is consistent with policy T6 of the London Plan, which allows for parking standards above 1.5 spaces per 3 bedroom dwelling where there is clear evidence that this would support additional family housing. The development would provide one off-street parking space to the rear of the site. This would be a shortfall on the minimum provision and would result in an increased demand for on-street parking.
12. On-street parking in Cardinal Way involves cars parking partially on the pavement due to its narrow width. While only a snapshot in time I saw during my visit that the marked parking bays were well used. My visit took place on a weekday morning and I have no reason to doubt that what I saw was unusual in terms of demand. I would also expect demand to be higher in the evenings.
13. Most houses in Cardinal Way have a single off-street parking space, while some also have integral garages although it is not clear if these are used for parking.

The proposed provision would therefore be consistent with that of surrounding properties. However, the standards require a higher provision for new development to avoid exacerbating existing demand. The proposed crossover would also involve the loss of an existing marked parking bay, so would further affect the supply of these spaces in the street.

14. The appellant has suggested that the proposed provision could be expanded at the cost of reducing the proposed garden space. However, I have no plans before me to show how this could be achieved. It is not clear that additional parking to the rear of the site would be possible without widening the proposed crossover. I have also considered whether parking could be provided at the front of the house, as is typical in the street. However, given the corner plot it is not clear that a crossover could safely be accommodated at the front of the site. I do not therefore consider that it would be reasonable to require provision of a second parking space by condition, even if I were otherwise minded to allow the appeal.
15. The appeal proposal would therefore fail to provide sufficient off-street parking to meet the demand generated by the development and would result in a loss of existing on-street parking. It would therefore conflict with the identified criteria of policies 24 of the Local Plan and T6 of the London Plan. It would also fail to comply with the requirement for high quality design in policy 26 of the Local Plan.

### **Other Matters**

16. The appellant has raised concerns about the council's handling of the case. This falls outside of my authority to address and is a matter to be resolved between the main parties.

### **Conclusion**

17. The council does not have a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. Planning permission should therefore be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
18. The proposal would create one new house, supporting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Given the shortfall in the council's supply of housing land, this attracts moderate weight in the overall balance.
19. Set against that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers and would provide insufficient off-street parking while reducing available on-street parking. Collectively these attract great weight, and significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that would arise from the development.
20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*M Chalk*

INSPECTOR