
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/20/3256057
183 Lincoln Road, Peterborough PE1 2PN

- 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 A Jabarkel (Gulli Barbers) against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01504/FUL, dated 23 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a steel roller shutter to shop window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The roller shutter has already been installed and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. A decision notice dated 28 November 2019 was issued by the Council indicating that permission had been granted. The Council have indicated that this was issued in error and so in February 2020 issued a new decision notice saying it was refused. I note that the first decision notice included the reason for refusal given on the second decision notice, rather than any conditions. Whilst I appreciate the appellant's frustration with this, the appeal was made against the refusal of planning permission and it is on this basis I have determined the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the roller shutter on the character and appearance of the area having particular regard to the crime risk to the property and potential alternative measures.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a barber's shop located in a busy area that contains a mix of commercial and residential uses. The roller shutter covers the entrance and front window of the shop. At the time of my visit the shop was open and the shutter up, but I understand it has a mesh galvanised steel appearance. It is housed in a black externally mounted shutter box above the window and below the fascia sign. This protrudes beyond the existing signage on the shop front.

6. Policy LP18 of the *Peterborough Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (adopted July 2019)* (LP) states that permission for external security shutters will only be granted when it has been demonstrated that there is a persistent problem of crime or vandalism affecting the property and that this cannot be addressed by alternative measures. The supporting text highlights that such shutters can not only be visually unattractive but can create a “dead” hostile appearance which reduces natural surveillance and so encourages crime. Similar, and more detailed advice is also provided in section 10 of the Peterborough Shop Front Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted January 2014) (SPD).
7. A number of other commercial premises in the area have externally fitted security shutters which vary in design and type. A number of these were down during the day and these confirmed that inappropriate security measures do indeed create a “dead” frontage and a poor quality street scene.
8. I have been provided with no evidence that the appeal building has been subject to break-ins or any other criminal activity. Whilst the police have stated that records show that the calls for incidents in this area are medium to high, they also indicate that there is no evidence of any threat to this particular property.
9. Moreover, I have not been given any evidence to suggest that alternative security solutions as suggested in the supporting text to the Policy LP18 and the SPD have been considered, and that they would not be able to provide the same level of security.
10. Consequently, I consider that the roller shutter would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area having particular regard to the crime risk to the property and potential alternative measures. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP18 of the LP outlined above.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR