



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by **V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3350877

4 Park Drive, Havering, Romford RM1 4LJ

- 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 Mrs Paulina Matuszczak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0587.24.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of domestic swimming pool, to Class E(d) to enable private 1-1 and 1-2 swimming lessons, with a maximum of 4 students at any one time. Hours of operation: Monday to Fridays 2pm-8pm. Weekends 9am-6pm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers in respect of noise; and;
 - parking.

Preliminary Matter

3. The red line on the existing and proposed plans do not correlate with the site location plan as they exclude the dwelling at the site. Given that the appellant has advised that the swimming pool is ancillary to the main dwelling, the site location plan which includes the dwelling would best reflect the proposal. The appeal will therefore consider the extent of the appeal site as denoted on the site location plan.

Reasons

Noise

4. The appeal site contains a swimming pool in a detached building located to the rear of 4 Park Drive. It is accessed from the side gate serving the rear garden of the property. The building adjoins the end of good sized rear gardens serving 12 and 14 Park Drive and is set in from the rear boundary with 3 The Avenue, which has a long garden. The remaining flank elevation runs parallel to a footpath located to the rear of the gardens serving the properties on Park Drive. The swimming pool is modest in size and positioned centrally within the building. Openable windows are positioned along the eastern flank elevation of the building.

5. Reference is made to the proposal resulting in an increase in noise above the existing domestic setting. It is alleged that when windows are opened for ventilation, that lessons with up to 4 children and 2 adults could impact neighbouring residential properties compared to the 'usual noise'. However, given the proposed use would be limited whereas the existing use is uncontrolled, it is plausible that the existing use could result in a comparable or greater noise impact than the proposed use. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would have a greater impact on neighbouring residential properties compared to the 'usual noise'.
6. In addition, given the separation distances between the appeal building and neighbouring properties, the modest size of the pool, it being enclosed and the proposed use being limited, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposal would unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers in respect of noise.
7. Interested parties raise potential noise and disruption arising from the use of the private footpath. However, the building can only be accessed from the side gate, as the front elevation of the building occupies the width of the plot. As a result, users of the pool would not require the use of the footpath.
8. The proposal would therefore have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers in respect of noise. It would therefore be compliant with Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan 2016- 2031, insofar as it supports development that does not result in unacceptable levels of noise.

Parking

9. The appeal site is located close to the junction with the A125 (North Street) and opposite the exit serving Romford bus garage. This section of the road has yellow and double yellow lines and on street parking is limited to four pay and display parking bays. At the time of my visit there were three vehicles parked on the driveway serving the property and the pay and display bays were all in use.
10. The proposal would increase the number of users of the site and therefore the demand for parking. Whilst siblings attending lessons would arrive in one car, there would still be a requirement for additional parking. Given that the proposed bike shelter would result in the loss of a parking space, the proposal would increase parking need but reduce the number of available car parking spaces in an area with limited parking.
11. Reference is made to the appellant and her family living in the Romford area and them looking into renting No.4, where it is claimed that there would be four spaces available on site. This would suggest that the appellant does not reside at the appeal site and casts doubt as to whether the driveway would be available for users of the pool. The Council has also advised that the site is currently used as a House in Multiple Occupancy which could further increase the need for parking. As a result, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that there would be adequate parking for the proposed use. Therefore, the use would increase parking pressure and could impinge on the free flow of traffic through indiscriminate parking.

12. The appellant refers to planning permission granted¹ at 31 Chudleigh Road, Romford, granted for the change of use of a swimming pool for private lessons. A further case is cited but the site location and details of this case have not been provided. From the information before me, the examples given would not be wholly comparable to the development before me to justify a planning permission. This is because both examples were able to provide adequate on site parking for clients.
13. Whilst the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of three, it is likely that some users of the pool would choose to arrive by private vehicle. Therefore, the accessibility of the site would not overcome the need to provide adequate parking.
14. Conditions have been suggested by the appellant to control the use. Whilst conditions could control the hours of use and number of pupils and lessons, they would not prevent the need to provide parking.
15. For the above reasons, the proposal would not provide adequate parking. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan 2016- 2031, insofar as it requires proposals that would result in the net loss of parking spaces to demonstrate that there is no need for those spaces.

Other Matters

16. Whilst there is local support for the proposal, objections have also been received as part of the appeal. All representations have been noted and considered in the determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR

¹ P0222.19