
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2017

by A A Phillips BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/Z/16/3160352
223-223a Ordnance Road, Enfield EN3 6AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Haydar Tum against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/02793/FUL, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front canopy with roller shutter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I note from the planning application and my observations on site that the application is retrospective. The canopy with roller shutter has been installed and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated on Ordnance Road, immediately adjacent to Enfield Lock railway station in a mainly residential area of Enfield. There are some ground floor retail and other commercial ground floor uses in the area. It is a two storey semi-detached property with a ground floor retail unit with associated shop front and canopy which cover almost all the ground floor frontage of the building.
 5. The extent of glazing across the shop frontage is minimal, providing little visual permeability into the shop. The only glazing is the door and consequently, although the signage on the property is quite clear that the property is being used for retail purposes there is little in the way of active frontage.
 6. As a consequence of the overall height and depth of the canopy, which sits above the sill height of the first floor windows, the feature dominates the building's frontage, harming the overall appearance of the prominent building and the street scene, generally. The canopy also protrudes significantly forward of the main building line of the street, which exacerbates its prominence and harmful effect.
-

7. The shutter is constructed of perforated metal which, although not solid, would provide little visual permeability to the retail unit. Therefore, when closed it would be harmful to the appearance of the building and the street scene, generally.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it conflicts with the design requirements of Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (November 2010) and Policies DMD 37 and DMD 40 of the Development Management Document (November 2014).

Other matters

9. I understand that the appellant has reasons for having erected the canopy and roller shutter, including protecting produce, improving security and meeting customers' expectations. However, none of these benefits outweighs my concerns with reference to the main issue. I have also taken into account the appellant's investment in carrying out the work, which does not outweigh the main issue and general planning considerations.
10. I also note that the appellant is willing to be advised on alternative solutions. I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the proposal before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR