
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/17/3179588
125-127 Belgrave Road, Ilford IG1 3LG

- 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 Shabnam Store against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1241/17, dated 14 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is removal of unauthorised structure to the premises and installation of new open fronted canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of new open fronted canopy at 125-127 Belgrave Road, Ilford IG1 3LG in accordance with the terms of application Ref 1241/17, dated 14 March 2017, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2368/1, 2368/2, 2368/3.

Preliminary matters

2. At the time of my visit the forecourt of the property was enclosed by a flat roofed structure incorporating roller shutters to the sides, which I understand does not have the benefit of planning permission. The proposal before me is a new open sided canopy without roller shutters following the removal of the unauthorised structure. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 125-127 Belgrave Road, lies at the end of a terrace of properties which falls within a designated 'key retail parade', and which provides a variety of retail and service uses. The property is currently in use as a greengrocers shop at ground floor level. It occupies a corner plot at a multiple road junction. The wider area surrounding the site is primarily residential, comprising predominantly terraced housing built around the turn of the 20th century. The

parade of shops is traditionally designed and appears to date from a similar time.

5. The appeal property is part of a later addition to the terrace and is partly two storeys and partly single storey in height. The first floor of the building is set back from the ground floor front elevation and the single storey element has a parapet wall, piers and railings at a high level. I understand that the forecourt of the premises has been used since 1980 for the display of produce for sale. Prior to the construction of the unauthorised structure, the externally displayed produce was protected by retractable awnings, which I note are a feature of other properties in the parade.
6. The proposed canopy would project some 1.8m from the frontage of the building over the forecourt and would extend around the side of the building. It would not encroach over or impede the use of the public footpath. The structure would have a glazed roof and decorative metal columns with slim sections.
7. I recognise that canopies are not an original feature of this parade of shops. Nevertheless, a visually lightweight, open sided canopy would not be unduly dominant, particularly in the context of the brightly coloured awnings and externally displayed goods locally. Moreover, this particular property is not in itself typical, in terms of its form or design, of others in the parade. Whilst the canopy would be a permanent feature that would be more apparent when goods were not being displayed, its design and scale would not be overbearing or detrimental to the character or appearance of the building, the frontage of which would remain legible. Consequently, although I recognise it would be seen from surrounding roads, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would not be contrary to Policies BD1 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 and Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 which seek, amongst other things to ensure that development is compatible with and appropriate to the locality.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted subject to conditions specifying the time limit and the approved plans in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR