The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/Z/19/3239448
1217 Greenford Road, Greenford UB6 0HY

- 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 Mr John Morrow of NCR Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 193236FUL, dated 9 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
- The development proposed is the installation of ATM cash machine and composite panel.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of ATM cash machine and composite panel at 1217 Greenford Road, Greenford UB6 0HY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 193236FUL, dated 9 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan and Proposed Elevation, Section and Proposed (Part) Plan (Drawing Ref. THANALAXMI Revision A).

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:

   - The effect of the development on the vitality of the Secondary Shopping Frontage along Greenford Road, and;
   - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Vitality and viability

3. The appeal site is a ground floor retail unit as part of a parade of shops that are designated as Secondary Shopping Frontage in the development plan. Policy 4B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (the DPD) states that development in any designated frontage should not result in a net loss of active frontage and should increase the active

frontage where appropriate. The supporting text to Policy 4B considers an active frontage to be composed of uses that are open to visiting members of the public throughout the day (such as shops and cafes) that are designed to address and be orientated towards the street.

4. The proposal would see the installation of an Automated Teller Machine (ATM) and composite panel surround within the left-hand side display window of the shopfront. This part of the existing frontage would be extended slightly forward to accommodate the ATM, but it would not protrude beyond the principal elevation of the building. There would be no change of use of the premises which would continue to operate as a retail unit and therefore there would be no loss of retail frontage.

5. The ATM would provide a service to visiting members of the public and would address the street for ease of access. Such facilities are now commonplace within shopping frontages and can actively attract consumers into retail centres, increasing footfall and thereby adding to the overall vitality of such areas. Therefore, the ATM would provide an active frontage that would complement the retail offer within the Secondary Shopping Frontage.

6. The Council has suggested that there is no need for the ATM as there are other ATMs in close proximity to the site. However, on my site visit I noted that the adjacent Barclays bank was now vacant and the two ATMs there had been removed. In any event, the need for the development is is not a determinative matter in my consideration of the appeal.

7. Consequently, the development would maintain an active frontage and therefore it would add to the vitality of the Secondary Shopping Frontage along Greenford Road. As a result, there would be no conflict with Policy 4B of the DPD or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to ensure the vitality and viability of town centres and other defined shopping areas.

Character and appearance

8. The parade of shopfronts along Greenford Road are relatively modern and vary considerably in their design and overall appearance. They are not traditional shopfronts and many of them have been substantially altered, with designs which include roller shutters, canopies and fascia's of varying sizes. The irregular design of the frontages and lack of any traditional features reduces the overall contribution that the parade of shops make to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

9. The appeal shopfront has a modern, central entrance door flanked on either side by a large display window set in aluminium frames. The frontage is stepped back from the street behind a roller shutter. This recess facilitates the display of fresh produce on portable shelving units when the shutters are open.

10. The installation of an ATM and composite surround, as proposed, would not be out of keeping with the modern appearance of the shopfront. I accept that the installation will take up a sizable proportion of the existing frontage, but I do not find this to be out of scale with the existing frontage, nor would it be an overly bulky form of development. Indeed, the development would reduce the amount of the frontage covered by the roller-shutters and would therefore improve the overall appearance of the shopfront outside of opening hours.

Furthermore, ATMs are to be expected at such locations and therefore the proposal would not appear as a discordant or unusual form of development.

11. The Council is concerned that there are three ATMs in close proximity to the appeal site and therefore an additional ATM would harm the character and appearance of the area. However, as noted above, the neighbouring unit, which included two ATMs, is now vacant and the ATMs have since been removed. As such, the proposal would not result in an over proliferation of ATMs in the area that could be considered to clutter the street scene.

12. For these reasons, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the DPD or Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which together seek high standards of design and to protect the character and appearance of the area. Similarly, in this regard, there would be no conflict with the policies of the Framework.

Conditions

13. I have imposed the standard timescale condition and a plans compliance condition as this provides certainty.

14. The Council suggested a condition to require external materials to be as per those listed in the approved plans. However, as I have imposed a plans compliance condition (Condition 2) which lists the approved plans this would be unnecessary repetition.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons I have set out, and subject to conditions, the appeal is allowed.

Jeff Tweddle

INSPECTOR