



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3261468

96A Goodmayes Road, Goodmayes, Ilford IG3 9UZ

- 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 Jakir Hossain against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Redbridge .
 - The application Ref 2312/20, dated 25 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a proposed awning & shutter for front sales area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The application site forms the forecourt area of a fruit and vegetable shop on the western side of Goodmayes Road and close to its junction with Kildowan Road. The shop occupies the ground floor part of an end of terrace three storey building which contains three other retail units on the ground floor and with similar sized forecourt areas. The applicant's shop has what appears to be a large fabric covered retractable awning which extends over a substantial display of fruit and vegetables and which was in use at the time of my visit. The Council also advises that the structure has rolling shutters, although these were not in evidence at the time of my visit, and that the structure has not received planning permission. As such I afford it little weight and have considered the proposal based on the merits or otherwise of the development before me.
4. The proposal is to enclose the forecourt display area with a waterproof awning roof and an open chain link aluminium shutter grill to the front and sides, which would appear to sit over some form of low plinth although the plans are not clear in that respect. It would be a substantial size, and the Council advises it would have a height of 3 metres, a depth of 3.5 metres and a width across the forecourt of 5.6 metres.
5. The appellant points out that the structure would provide a more weatherproof arrangement for the fruit and vegetables and would be similar in size to the

existing awning which has apparently been there for many years. It is suggested that there are a variety of buildings and forms within the area which has no uniform character and would therefore not look out of place.

6. I acknowledge that the area is of mixed character with a variety of different architectural styles. Also, that the current arrangement has a significant visual impact in the street scene because of the extent of the display. That is not unusual for retail premises displaying their goods on forecourts and indeed I noted that the adjoining hardware store does the same thing. However, the important distinction is that such displays are temporary with goods taken in at the end of the working day or when the premises are not in use. The visual impact is therefore temporary. In contrast, the proposed structure, although somewhat lightweight, would add a significant degree of permanence to the streetscene.
7. Because of its significant size, it would be highly prominent in both directions along Goodmayes Road and also when approaching that road from Castleton Road opposite. It would protrude well in front of the building line, even allowing for the slight set back of the terrace from the adjoining properties to the south, and in that context, I agree with the Council that it would give rise to a bulky intrusive and incongruous structure, poorly related to the host building, and would cause visual harm as a result. I note the appellant's reference to the Council approving other awnings nearby, but in the context of this particular local environment and having walked up and down Goodmayes Road, I noted that there were no other similar structures in front of retail premises, including the adjoining terrace of shops. In the local context therefore, it would appear out of character within this particular streetscene.
8. I acknowledge the need to encourage vibrancy to retail centres, but it seems to me that the current display of goods is already performing that role well and there is no evidence before me that the business is performing badly or potentially failing in the absence of such a large and more permanent structure.
9. Whilst I can appreciate that it would be more convenient to accommodate goods within the enclosed structure, thus necessitating them not having to be taken indoors at the end of the working day, such convenience does not override the greater visual harm which would result.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP28 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 in that it would not be of high urban design quality and would not respect the character of the area.
11. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR