Officer Report

Application Number:	**HGY/2026/2657**
Application Type:	**Full planning permission**
Address:	Shop, 151 Lordship Lane, Tottenham, London, N17 6XE
Proposal:	Retention of enclosed canopy to front of shop (retrospective)
Case Officer:	Adam Silverwood
Valid Date:	23/09/2026
Applicant:	Mr Sertac Aslan
Agent:	Mr Kenan Kara

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Proposed Development
This is a retrospective application for the retention of an enclosed front canopy.

2. Site and Surroundings
The application site is a commercial unit located on the ground floor of a three-storey building. The application site forms the end of an undesignated parade of shops and is adjacent residential properties. The area is a mix of commercial and residential uses.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History
There is no planning history associated with this application.

5. Local Representations
The application has been publicised by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties. No representations were received from neighbours, local groups, etc.

6. Material Planning Considerations
The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and Impact of the proposed development on the Character and Appearance of the Area;
2. Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity

Design and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area
Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) states that 'all new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area', development 'a) must relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole; b) make a positive contribute to a place improving the character and

quality of an area; c) confidently address feedback from local consultation; d) demonstrate how the quality of development will be secured when it is built; e) are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles'.

Policy DM8 (Shopfronts, Signs and On Street Dining) of the Haringey DMD (2017) requires that shops should allow for easy access by all members of the community and where on street dining is considered it must be integral and functionally related to the operation of the business, be distinct from the paving space and be composed solely of movable furniture.

Paragraph 2.54 elaborates that 'on-street dining facilities can add to the vibrancy of shopping centres or public squares. However these should not disrupt normal pedestrian movement or other high-street activities and where possible should integrate with the public realms of the surrounding area. Temporary furniture would allow for the flexibility of the space to be converted back to public use.

The proposed application seeks permission for the retention of an enclosed front canopy outside the entrance of the commercial property with polycarbonate sheeting with timber frames. There would be a ramp that facilitates equitable access.

The applicant has provided some example applications as supporting evidence: 159 and 155 Lordship Lane, N17 6XE (these do not have any associated planning application approved) and 185 – 187 Lordship Lane N17 6XF (HGY/2014/3006), 600 Seven Sisters Road (HGY/2024/2558), 604 Seven Sisters Road N15 6HT (HGY/2019/0580) and 8c Westbury Avenue (HGY/2012/1752).

Officers note that the site 159 Lordship Lane has a refused planning permission (HGY/2015/1877) for an existing awning with polycarbonate sheets. This application was refused on the grounds of 'siting, poor design and poor quality materials.

It is considered that while there is some capacity for these properties to have an eclosed or partly enclosed seating area at the front of the main entrance, the proposed polycarbonate plastic sheeting is considered to not be of sufficient quality to contribute positively to the surrounding environment. Officers appreciate that there are other examples of similar scale, however these are of more substantial construction with more sympathetic materials to the surrounding environment.

The property 159 has an awning with retractable sides that facilities opening up and is of reasonable construction quality so as to not be imposing, while 8c is a timber structure with retractable awning. The retention of the enclosed canopy utilises too much polycarbonate for a sizable fully enclosed structure that would result in a prominent addition to the street scene and is therefore not considered to be contribute to an improvement of the public realm along Lordship Lane and is therefore recommended for refusal on these grounds.

Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High-Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours.

Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

The proposed development is located adjacent a residential property where the commercial shopping parade comes to an end and would project 3.8 metres forward of the existing front elevation. The application needs to consider the impact of the use of this area for seating associated with the café and the impact of the physical structure on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

There would likely be some noise impact on the occupiers of the adjoining property due to the outside seating, while only for the intended opening hours of 7am until 6pm, this is considered to be detrimental to the amenity of this property. The application site is not located within a defined local town centre where the operation of the commercial premises would be given greater weight and a higher degree of noise overspill may be tolerated. The retention of this canopy would support the seating of an additional eight persons between approximately 1m and 1.5 metres from the property's front windows.

Officers appreciate that the inclusion of a physical barrier in this location would mitigate the impact of the use of the outside on adjoining occupiers by blocking noise. However, as this is polycarbonate sheeting and a lightweight material this is not considered to block noise to a sufficient extent to be considered acceptable.

Conclusion
This retrospective application by reason of its siting, poor design and poor quality materials, would detract from the architectural appearance of the frontage of which the premises form part and would adversely affect the visual amenity of the locality contrary to Policy DM1 and DM8 of the Harringay DMD (2017) and policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan.

7. CIL Applicable
N/A – Under 100sqm no new unit.

8. Recommendation
It is therefore recommended that this application be REFUSED for the following reason:

This retrospective application by reason of its siting, poor design and poor quality materials, would be detrimental to the architectural appearance of the frontage of which the premises form part and would adversely affect the visual amenity of the locality and amenity of adjoining properties contrary to Policy DM1 and DM8 of the Harringay DMD (2017) and policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan.

Refusal Reasons:

This retrospective application by reason of its siting, poor design and poor quality materials, would be detrimental to the architectural appearance of the frontage of which the premises form part and would adversely affect the visual amenity of the locality and amenity of adjoining properties contrary to Policy DM1 and DM8 of the Harringay DMD (2017) and policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan.