

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/Z/16/3162714
27d-27e The Quadrant, Richmond TW9 1DN

- 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 Sainsbury Supermarkets Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
 - The application Ref 16/2619/FUL, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the installation of 1 ATM machine to the front elevation with an associated sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Central Richmond Conservation Area and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a foodstore which is situated in a busy town centre adjacent to Richmond Station and within the Central Richmond Conservation Area. The property has a staggered 2-part frontage which incorporates large expanses of glazing, significant parts of which have been blanked out. The proposal would involve the installation of an ATM set within the forward frontage surrounded by an orange "lozenge surround" and plum vinyl attached to the inside of the glass.
 4. I note that planning permission was granted in 2011 for the replacement of the shop front of the appeal property and the installation of an ATM at the left hand side of a wholly glazed frontage (ref: 11/2990/FUL). As the appeal proposal would be centrally located and set within an opaque surround I attribute limited weight to the 2011 permission.
 5. Whilst the proposal would involve alterations to a modern shopfront, due to its siting, and the extent, colour and opacity of the surround, it would be a garish addition to the street scene that would unacceptably further reduce the extent of transparent shop frontage. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal
-

would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve the character of the Central Richmond Conservation Area. It is therefore contrary to Policies DM HD 1 and DM DC 7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan (2011) which seek high quality design where alterations to existing shopfronts are proposed and the protection of conservation areas. There is also conflict with the broad aims of Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy (2009) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: 'Shopfronts' (2010).

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR