
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3364580

2 Fairland Road, Stratford, Newham, London E15 4AF

- 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 Jabang Singh (Landas Care Services Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01751/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from single dwelling house (Use Class C3) to a children's home (Use Class C2).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) the effect of the proposed loss of a dwellinghouse upon the supply of housing, and
 - ii) whether the proposed development would make adequate provision for cycle storage facilities.

Reasons

Loss of dwellinghouse

3. Policy H4 of the Newham Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) and Policy H8 of The London Plan seek to protect against the loss of all housing, unless it is replaced by new housing. Although Policy H8 of The London Plan also seeks to protect shared and supported accommodation that meets an identified housing need, it is also clear that the loss of existing housing should be replaced by new housing at existing or higher densities. The supporting text to Local Plan Policy H4 does set out particular concerns on dwelling conversions to flats or to houses in multiple occupation, but the policy wording seeks to protect all housing, specifically 3 bed and 4+ bed family housing irrespective of the proposed use. The proposal, which seeks a change of use to a children's care home, would result in the loss of housing and it would therefore be contrary to these development plan policies.
4. I therefore conclude that the loss of the existing residential unit would have a harmful effect on the supply of housing and as such, it would be contrary to Policies S1, S6, H1 and H4 of the Local Plan and Policy H8 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to protect and increase the supply of family housing. As a result of the loss of a house suitable for families with children, it

would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which at Section 5 seeks, amongst other matters, to deliver a sufficient supply of homes.

Cycle storage facilities

5. The proposal did not provide any information in relation to cycle parking. There is however sufficient space within the curtilage to accommodate such provision. I therefore consider that this matter could have been addressed by a suitable condition, had the development been otherwise acceptable.
6. I therefore conclude that the development would be acceptable in relation to making adequate provision for cycle storage facilities. As such, it would be compliant with Policies SP8 and INF2 of the Local Plan, Policy T5 of The London Plan and the Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality cycling facilities to support sustainable travel.

Other Matters

7. The proposal would not result in any undue disturbance to neighbouring occupiers or harm arising from the fear of crime. It also proposes no internal or external alterations. These are neutral matters and not ones which weigh in favour of the development.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

8. The Framework requires the needs of groups with specific housing requirements to be addressed, with Local Plan Policy H3 setting out support for new specialist accommodation that meets local need. The need for the proposed children's care home is not disputed which would provide for disadvantaged young people, and this is a matter that weighs in favour of the proposal.
9. However, the proposed development would also result in the loss of an existing house, and more specifically, a 3 bedroom family-sized dwelling which the Local Plan puts a particular emphasis on protecting given the extent of family housing lost to conversion, and also this being the type of housing where the greatest need lies.
10. As such, despite the benefits of the proposal, this would not outweigh the harm that would arise from the loss of the family-size housing unit. The other matters as set out, including the lack of harm in relation to cycle parking provision, are neutral considerations.
11. 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. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR