



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3240105

40 Bounces Road, Edmonton N9 8HY

- 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 Barrett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00493/FUL, dated 28 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "a wooden structure to be built onto the front of the shop. The structure will have sides."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. It was clear from my site visit that the proposed "low level walls" have been constructed, so the proposal is part retrospective.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated in a prominent location on the corner of Bounces Road and Oxford Road. It lies at the end of a short residential terrace where only the appeal premises and the adjoining premises are in commercial use and have shop frontages at ground floor level with forecourt areas to the front. The main shopping parade lies on the opposite side of Bounces Road and also further to the east on both sides of the road. As such, the appeal property is more closely related to the adjoining residential properties.
5. I acknowledge that the canopy would be constructed of 'lightweight materials' and have partially open sides. The polycarbonate roof would also have some translucency. Even so, it would still represent a substantial structure projecting forward of the building line and over the entire forecourt area up to the pavement on Bounces Road and Oxford Road. As the only such structure on the terrace and due to its size, position and solid lower walls, it would be noticeably prominent. Moreover, whilst it would not result in the loss of architectural features, its materials, roof profile and positioning on the front elevation of the building would not respect the host building's existing vernacular, including the

character of front enclosures. As such, it would be highly intrusive and incongruous.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD37 and DMD40 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014). These require, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality of design, appropriate to its context, contributes positively to the character of the area, and respects the style and proportions of the building it forms a part of.

Other Matters

7. I have noted the comments from other interested parties regarding public safety and the potential to set a precedent, but as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons I do not need to consider these matters any further as they would not alter my decision.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR