
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 09 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/17/3169524
562 Cranbrook Road, Ilford IG2 6RE

- 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 B Arudshankhor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5630/16, dated 2 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is change of use of retail shop (A1 class use) into restaurant/takeaway (A3 and A5 class use) with installation of extraction and ducting system to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the vitality and retail function of the retail parade.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located with the Barkingside Key Retail Parade. Policy R1 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (DPD, May 2008) seeks to protect the predominantly retail function at ground floor level within Key Retail Parades (KRPs). Change of use away from A1 retail within these areas will be required to comply with DPD Policy R3.
 4. As a general guideline, DPD Policy R3 requires that the proportion of A1 units shall be no less than 70% of the total number of units within KRPs. Schedule 4 of the DPD defines the Barkingside KRP as including: 1-3 Beattyville Gardens; 779-793 Cranbrook Road; 552-586, 685-713 Cranbrook Road; 165-173 Longwood Gardens, and; 1-15 Longwood Parade. Of these 22 units, 64% are in A1 usage. The proposal would reduce this figure to 59%, which would be significantly below the recommended 70% threshold.
 5. In addition, DPD Policy R3 specifically restricts A3/A5 uses, which mainly serve an evening trade, to a maximum of 20% of the total number of units. The proposal would bring this figure to 27%, which would substantially exceed the maximum percentage. I consider that the proposed loss of the A1 unit would result in an excessive number of non-retail uses in the Barkingside KRP. The retail function would be divided, thereby unacceptably harming its vitality.
-

6. The appellant argues that the commercial parade in question extends only to the eight units which are located between Icknield Drive and Glenham Drive. However, this position is not borne out by the DPD, which clearly defines the Barkingside KRP within Schedule 4. In any case, by the appellant's own estimation, the proposal would increase the percentage of A3/A5 uses to 25%, which would still exceed the recommended 20%.
7. My attention has been drawn to appeal decision ref APP/M5450/A/03/1125190. However, the circumstances in which this proposal was found to be acceptable are not before me, and in any event, each case is to be decided on its own merits. I accept that the main Barkingside shopping parades are some distance away from the appeal site, but that would not mitigate the harm I have identified. The appellant argues that the proposal would bring economic benefit to the community, providing employment and generating a profitable business at the appeal site. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate the economic benefits the proposed development would generate in comparison to the existing retail unit. I can therefore give little weight to this argument.
8. In the absence of any compelling reason to depart from the provisions of the local plan policies, I conclude that the proposal would be materially harmful to the vitality and retail function of the retail parade, contrary to the objectives of DPD Policies R1 and R3.
9. For those reasons, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR