
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/19/3236806
89 Belgrave Road, Ilford IG1 3AL

- 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 Perwaiz Mukhtar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2934/19, dated 8 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is wooden canopy at the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site includes a wooden-framed canopy at the front with plastic corrugated roofing sheets. There is also a plywood screen to the side. The appellant seeks planning permission for the canopy, including the replacement of the plywood screen to the side with a perspex sheet. As the canopy shown on the proposed plan is different to the canopy that has been built, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development shown on the proposed plan.
3. The description of proposed development shown on the Council's decision notice is different to that shown on the appellant's appeal form and the planning application form. There is no information before me to show that an amended description was agreed by the appellant. I have therefore used the description shown on the planning application form in the banner heading and determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, and (ii) highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site relates to a ground floor greengrocers shop within a Victorian 3 storey building. The original shopfront displays traditional features, including pilasters, corbels and cornices. Modern fascia signs and shutter boxes are

- positioned below the cornice of the shopfront. The premises is within a designated 'Key Retail Parade', which provides a range of shops and services.
6. The proposed canopy would extend around 2 metres to the front of the building and would be approximately 8.5 metres wide. It would cover the forecourt area, which is used to display produce for sale.
 7. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's reference to the guidance in the Redbridge Shopfront and Fascia Design (Outside conservation areas) Supplementary Planning Guidance Adopted 2004, the design of the proposed canopy is rudimentary and it would fail to respect the vertical proportions of the existing building. Furthermore, the positioning of the timber posts would bear little relationship to the design of the shopfront. The use of poor quality materials, including timber posts; plastic corrugated roofing sheets; and a perspex side panel, would add to the crude appearance of the proposed canopy.
 8. I observed that some of the nearby shopfronts have retractable awnings, however the proposed canopy is a fixed structure which is not comparable in respect of its size, design and materials. The appellant's statement refers to a fixed canopy structure at 125 Belgrave Road, which is some distance from the appeal property and is not viewed in the same context. Nevertheless, I observed that the canopy structure at No 125 is constructed in higher quality materials and achieves a more refined design. In any event, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own individual planning merits.
 9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies LP9, LP26 and LP28 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, which, amongst other things, requires that development consists of high quality details and materials, and shopfronts that respect the overall character of the building on which they are located.

Highway and pedestrian safety

10. The proposed canopy would be positioned on the forecourt of the appeal property, which is used for the display of produce for sale. It would not encroach over or impede the use of the public footpath. There would therefore be sufficient space for pedestrians, pushchairs and wheelchair users to pass unobstructed.
11. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would not be harmful to highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy LP26 and LP28 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, which amongst other things, requires development to provide recognisable through routes and to ensure that additions to shopfronts would not cause undue interference with pedestrian flows or give rise to safety concerns over pedestrian/vehicular conflict.

Other Matters

12. The Council has cited Policies LP10, LP22 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 in the decision notice, which I consider are not directly relevant to the main issues. Nevertheless, this would not alter my decision.

13. I have had regard to the benefit that the proposed canopy would provide to the appellant in respect of the provision of a cover for the forecourt display area. However, this consideration does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the proposed development would not cause harm to highway and pedestrian safety. However, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area and this is sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR