The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2018

by G. Rollings, BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/18/3200193
Rockys, 81 Norwood Road, Southall, UB2 4DZ

- 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 Mrs Natalie Gaunt (New Wave Installations Cardtronics UK Ltd.) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref: 17/8472/FUL dated 23 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2018.
- The development is an ATM Pod in grey finished steel, with grey steel ATM fascia and non-illuminated black and green decal signage. Installation is on the existing hardstanding in front of and to the right of the glazed shop front, left of the low brick wall and railings on a new concrete base. Three bollards have been installed on the ATM Pod concrete base.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development that is the subject of this appeal has been installed. Having undertaken an inspection of the development, I am satisfied that the appeal plans and other documentation are an accurate representation of what has been erected on the site.

3. The appellant's description of the development included information pertaining to the advertisements which have also been installed on the kiosk. In the description of the development at the top of this letter, I have included only that part of the appellant's description relating to the building, and have omitted any references to the advertisements, which are the subject of a separate appeal that I have considered concurrently.[1]

4. The Government published an updated version of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) on 24 July 2018. This supersedes the previous 2012 version and applies to all planning decisions from this date. As it was published after the parties provided their evidence, they were provided with an opportunity to comment on the updated Framework and its impact on the appeal case.

[1] Appeal ref: APP/A5270/H/18/3200197.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises an end-of-terrace, two-storey building, accommodating a ground floor commercial property adjoined by an open forecourt, located on the corner or Norwood Road and Victoria Road. The development comprises a kiosk housing an automated teller machine (ATM), which adjoins the property boundary with the residential property at 83 Norwood Road.

7. The terrace incorporating the appeal site is formed of a row of residences and the commercial use on the ground floor of the appeal site. Each of the properties have a forecourt, with most used as driveways, separated by low fences or vegetation. The kiosk is set approximately midway along the boundary with No. 83, and is stands against the low boundary wall. Its prominent position means that it is clearly visible across the neighbouring forecourts, together with both Norwood Road approaches.

8. The kiosk is a tall structure and although in some views it appears against the background of the commercial use of the appeal site, within a partly commercial context, its freestanding position and discrete nature means that it appears obtrusive and out of place within the predominantly residential character of the surrounding area. I acknowledge the appellant's comments that the design of the development is consistent with that of the shop frontage in the area, but this does not reduce its prominence or incongruity within the street scene.

9. I therefore conclude that the development has a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with the Council's adopted *Development Management Development Plan Document* (2013) Policies 7.4 and 7B, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of *The London Plan* (2016), which together require development to attain a high design quality and be appropriate within their context, amongst other considerations.

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR