
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3230970
104 Tottenham Road, Southgate N13 6DG

- 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 Adamos Dimitriou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00444/FUL, dated 3 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the installation of roller shutter and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's description of development as contained in its decision notice more accurately reflects the appeal proposal. I have therefore used this description in my decision, rather than the one provided on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Tottenham Road and is a ground floor retail unit with residential to the first floor. The site is adjoined by a retail unit with a front extension and a 2-storey terraced property. The area is predominantly residential in character, with Tottenham Road characterised by traditional 2 storey terraced houses. However, there are a number of ground floor retail units in the local area and a pub on the corner of the Wolves Lane and Tottenham Road junction. The site has an existing canopy which covers the ground floor retail area. On my site visit I noted that the open frontage of the appeal site was being used for the display of goods, as were the other retail units on the street.
5. The proposal seeks to replace the existing canopy with one, that although not as wide, would protrude further forwards and upwards. The proposal would align with the front extension to the neighbouring property No 102 Tottenham Road. Whilst the proposal would align with the adjacent retail unit, it would

protrude significantly more than the residential properties the other side of the appeal site. The canopy owing to its size and materials, would be more visibly apparent than the existing canopy when travelling along Tottenham Road.

6. The proposed roller shutters would be retracted when the shop was trading and extended when the premises were closed. This would be in stark contrast to the brickwork façades of the appeal building and adjoining residential properties. It would add to the prominence of the retail unit, in an area characterised by residential development. Therefore, both the canopy and roller shutter would form an incongruous addition to the front of the property and the wider street scene.
7. I note that the appellant has highlighted the existence of the other existing retail properties on Tottenham Road due to their front canopies, which I was able to see on my site visit. However, their presence does not automatically mean this appeal should be allowed. Indeed, the Council has highlighted that whilst Nos 112-114 Tottenham has a similar front extension, it was built without planning consent. I also note that the appellant considers this proposal would help to cover the canopy of the adjacent property, which they consider to have a negative impact on the street scene. However, this would not outweigh the harm caused by the proposal itself.
8. The Council has also highlighted that the proposed development is similar to a previously refused planning application¹ which was subsequently dismissed on appeal². However, I do not have the associated documentation for this scheme before me. In any case, I must assess the proposal before me on its own merits. Therefore, I give the above limited weight in the determination of my decision.
9. The proposed development would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, adopted 2015, Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy, adopted 2010, Policies DMD 37 and DMD 40 of the Enfield Development Management Document, adopted 2014. These policies amongst other things, seek new development to have a high standard of design and have regard to its local context. They also seek to ensure that extensions to ground floor frontages, respect the rhythm, style and proportions of the existing building of which they form.

Other Matters

10. The appellant suggests that the proposal would have economic benefits for the area and for the viability of the shop. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR

¹ 15/05290/FUL

² APP/Q5300/W/16/3152892