



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3368609

Edgars Food & Wine, 271 Prince Regent Lane, London E13 8SD

- 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 Mrs Dayananth Vasanthanathan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01856/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as the construction of *"a canopy to the front of the shop to allow for vegetable display stand"*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's grounds of appeal describe the proposal as the "installation of a temporary canopy". The application drawings however clearly show the erection of a permanent structure and permission has not explicitly been sought for this structure to be in place for a specified period of time. For these reasons I do not consider this appeal to relate to a planning application for a temporary structure.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings, and
 - (ii) the vitality and viability of existing local and town centres.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property forms part of a handsome red brick terrace comprising retail units on the ground floor and prominent dormers in the street-facing roof slope. Like some of its neighbours, the appeal property has a forecourt area which is covered by a canopy during opening hours so that produce can be displayed outdoors close to the pavement. The property forms part of a Local Shopping Parade.
5. The proposal would essentially comprise the erection of a steel-framed, single-storey, almost full-width front extension with a flat roof, aluminium clad sides and a roller shutter to the frontage facing the pavement. Whilst similar in footprint to the

covered outdoor area currently utilised during opening hours, the proposal would be a permanent element in the street scene. As such it would be entirely at odds with the neighbouring temporary structures. In addition, the utilitarian nature of the proposal would be incompatible with the appearance of the terrace. Overall the proposal would be an alien and incongruous addition to the street scene.

6. Due to its siting, size and appearance, I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings. Consequently, it fails to accord with Policies SP1 and SP3 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018) (NLP) which seek high quality development that respects, takes advantage of, and enhances the positive elements and distinctive features of the borough. There is also conflict with the design aims of Policies D3 and D8 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Vitality and viability

7. Whilst the proposal would extend the shop unit it would not materially change the amount of space available for the display of goods for sale as the site of the extension is already used for this purpose. As such the proposal would not result in a material intensification of a town centre use outside of a designated local or town centre. For this reason the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the vitality and viability of existing local and town centres and there is no conflict with NLP Policies SP6 and INF5, which set out a clearly defined network and hierarchy of town and local centres in the Borough, or the aims of the Framework.
8. I note that the proposal would remove the need to move the display units when the shop opens and closes. This private benefit resulting from the proposal does not outweigh the harm to the public realm identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out under the first main issue above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR