



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2017

by **Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 31 May 2017

---

### Appeal Ref: **APP/N5660/Z/17/3169409**

### **Gipsy Hill Railway Station, Gipsy Hill, London SE19 1QL**

- 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 Cardtronics UK Limited trading as Cashzone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - The application Ref 16/04872/FUL was refused by notice dated 11 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is the installation of an Automated Teller Machine.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

### Reasons

3. The proposal is to install an Automated Teller Machine (ATM) in a side return wall at the front of the main railway station building at Gipsy Hill. The host property is a pleasing example of a red brick Victorian station building. It stands to one side of the highway and occupies a prominent position in the local street scene. In views from the road, in both directions, the appeal building, with its traditional style, has a relatively distinguished presence. It is a landmark building that positively and significantly contributes to the quality of the local townscape and the character and appearance of the Gipsy Hill Conservation Area (CA), within which the site is located. The CA derives its significance as a designated heritage asset mainly from the character and qualities of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century buildings that principally address Gipsy Hill.
  4. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Policy Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (LP) reflects this statutory duty.
  5. For northbound users of Gipsy Hill in particular, the proposed ATM would draw the eye as a modern machine-made element that would be at odds with the traditional style of the host building. It would appear as a visually intrusive addition and a conspicuous feature notwithstanding the position of the new ATM set back from the road and recessed into the wall. Its prominence would
-

be exacerbated especially after dark by illumination within the machine itself together with the illuminated advertising signage to which the plans and the Council's decision notice also refer.

6. Although an existing sign would be removed to make way for the ATM, the proposal would introduce a new modern feature that would jar with the intrinsic character of the host building. By causing material harm in this way, the proposal would reduce the positive contribution of the main station building to the CA. In doing so, the new ATM would have a deleterious effect on the character and appearance of the local area and that of the CA, which would fail to be preserved, to which I attach considerable importance and weight.
7. The harm caused by the proposal on the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset would be less than substantial. In those circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. As a 24-hour bank facility that provides a free cash dispensing service in an accessible location, the new ATM would provide a service to all within the local community as well as to visitors to the railway station. In doing so, the proposal would support local residents, business and the local economy. However, these public benefits do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
8. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with LP Policies Q11 and Q22, which aim to ensure that development positively responds to the original architecture of the host building and, within conservation areas, preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the heritage asset. It would also be contrary to several policies of the Framework most notably, the emphasis placed on securing high quality design and the importance of preserving if not enhancing heritage assets.
9. I note that the appellant is willing to make changes and come to an agreement with the Council on the signage. However, the new ATM itself would be an unsympathetic addition and is objectionable for the reasons given.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Gary Deane*

INSPECTOR