
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2022

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/21/3281885
167-169, Ilford Lane, Ilford, IG1 2RT

- 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 Zeeshan Ali and Mr Haqnawaz Rehman against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref.2510/21 dated 8 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, the parade, and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The site is a two-storey end of terrace building located within a retail parade within the Ilford Lane Local Centre. It occupies a corner location with Grange Road running at right angles to Ilford Lane. The ground floor is commercial, currently selling fruit, vegetables and groceries, with residential flats above. There is a barber's shop on the corner with Grange Road, having existing shutters on the Grange Road return frontage and on the narrow angled elevation between the Ilford Lane and Grange Road frontages. No change is proposed to these 2 short facades.
4. The proposal is to build out an enclosed structure supported on steel columns projecting out from the face of the building by 1.89m. This would replace an existing open canopy. The structure would be 3m high at the front, and extending the full width of the 2 shop units. The roof would be formed at a shallow pitch and would be constructed of 'double sheet steel'. The top of the structure at the front and sides would consist of the shutter boxes. The whole of the structure between the supporting steel columns would have roller shutters; the structure would be fully open-sided when the shutters were rolled away.
5. The development plan for the borough is the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted in March 2018. The 2 policies that bear most on the appeal proposal

are LP26 and LP28. Policy LP26 requires good design and 'place making', and seeks high quality design in all developments within the borough. The most material part of Policy LP28 states that the Council will support signage in designated town centres and key retail parades that: "*(a) Ensure that shopfronts (emphasis added) and signs placed on buildings respect the overall character and appearance of the building and the street scene;*". These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the emphasis given to good design.

6. The appellant suggests that the proposed development will enhance the vitality and viability of the area, and so will comply with the thrust of relevant development plan policies and the Framework, and that the proposal would not affect the character and appearance of the existing building. In the appellant's opinion the proposal would be not be grossly detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the street by damaging the style and symmetry and openness of the frontages. It is also pointed out that, when closed, the shutters would not allow views of the shopfront, which would reduce the likelihood of fear of crime.
7. At my site visit I paid particular attention to the example of existing frontages drawn to my attention by the appellant. There are front verandas/canopies to the shops within the Ilford Lane Local Centre, some with a degree of enclosure. However, the majority of canopies have open sides which maintain the open character of the street scene and minimise the bulk, maintaining the visual openness of the street scene.
8. The proposed canopy and shutters would provide a more protected trading space, and the shutters would assist with reducing the threat of crime at non-trading times. However, the front extension, particularly when the shutters were in a closed position, would not respect the character and appearance of the host building, or the style and openness of the frontages within this parade. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the parade would be harmful, detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the streetscene, contrary to Policies LP26 and LP28 of the Local Plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR