
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025 by A Khan BSC (Hons) MA MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/Z/24/3355594

103C Green Lane Road, Leicester LE5 3TP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adil Hussain against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 20241360.
 - The development proposed is for front canopy & roller shutter 'A'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The development subject to this appeal has already been carried out and planning permission is therefore being sought retrospectively.
4. There are other roller shutters installed at the appeal property, however, the appellant has sought planning permission for roller shutter (A) as shown on the submitted plans and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is located on a high traffic road primarily comprising ground floor commercial units and upper floor residential dwellings. Some shopfront designs have front canopies which align with their colour theme. Generally, these canopies are of the retractable style. Roller shutters are prominent in the area and typically match the colour scheme of the shopfront.
7. The front canopy consists of a felt roof and UPVC front hanging. Although the UPVC material is lightweight and reflects light onto the display area underneath, the transparency and plastic-like finish create a harsh glare which detracts from the visual identity of the shopfront and surrounding area.

8. In addition, the hanging nature of the canopy, with internal supporting materials clearly visible, further diminishes the visual integrity and coherence of the shopfront. The appellant's suggestion to colour-coat the canopy would not sufficiently mitigate the poor choice of material.
9. The use of UPVC and felt roof do not align with the overall shopfront design and colour scheme, which projects a low-quality appearance and temporary character. The temporary, lightweight nature of the materials emphasise the lack of integration and therefore do not contribute to the surrounding area's established shopfront design.
10. I acknowledge there are canopies to several other properties. As I have identified, these generally comprise retractable canopies which are not the same as the development before me. Some of the solid additions serve to demonstrate the harm that can be caused to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area from inappropriate additions. Either way, I am not aware of the planning background to any of these other examples, and have, in any event, determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
11. Matching materials is a prominent element within the commercial area, and with careful choice of material and design, would not necessarily create a bulky effect. In any case, the appellant's argument that matching materials would create a bulky and incongruous structure does not justify the use of materials that fail to respect the character and appearance of the area.
12. The benefits of a canopy to allow customers to view goods in any weather and potential contribution to local economic activity from the appellant are noted. However, such benefits are not quantified and are likely to be limited. Furthermore, I am not convinced that the appeal development is the sole means of achieving these benefits. I therefore give them limited weight. Similarly, although the canopy screens the external shutter housing, provides cover and lighting during darkness, this does not sufficiently justify the poor choice of materials which diminish the visual quality of the shopfront and area.
13. Roller shutter A is situated to the far left of the appeal site's shopfront and utilises a solid design with dark grey colour. The solid roller shutter creates a closed off, unwelcoming appearance when in use, especially outside business hours. The roller shutter therefore projects a harsh and dominant appearance, which is incongruous to the design of the shopfront and surrounding area.
14. While many shops along Green Lane Road use similar solid shutters, this does not justify further proliferation of a feature that detracts from the character and appearance of the street scene. I do not have full details of the planning background to these other examples in order to give them significant weight in the appeal.
15. The appellant raises security concerns, including incidents of vandalism, which necessitate the presence of the shutter. This is supported by correspondence from Leicestershire Police. However, there is no evidence that alternative shutter designs have been considered to address security needs which maintain a sympathetic appearance.
16. The scale, materials and design of the canopy, combined with the roller shutter, creates a visually discordant appearance. Whilst the appellant has raised valid

points regarding the security benefits of the solid shutter and the functional advantages of the canopy, these do not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the shopfront and surroundings. The development, comprising the front canopy and roller shutter A, fails to positively integrate into the building or its surroundings. Therefore, the development harms the character and appearance of the area.

17. Consequently, the development conflicts with the design standards of Policy CS3 of the Leicester City Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (2014), which emphasises that development should positively contribute to an area's character and appearance. The development also conflicts with Saved Policy BE11 of the City of Leicester Local Plan 1996 – 2016 (2006), which allows roller shutters for external security provided they allow some visibility into the shop and are colour coated to match the shopfront. The development conflicts with the Leicester City Council Shop Front Design Guide (2017), which discourages plastic canopies and solid shutters.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR