



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2022

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3274589

Unit 3, Greenford Park, Auriol Drive, Greenford UB6 0TP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Don Then against the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 204889FUL is dated 27 November 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as the project involves the installation of two blast chill units to the rear elevation, connecting to the existing building, of the Kerry Foods, Noon production factory known as Spurway Foods. This facility is located at Auriol Drive, Greenford UB6 0TP.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side/rear extension to accommodate two demountable blast chill units at Unit 3, Greenford Park, Auriol Drive, Greenford UB6 0TP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 204889FUL, dated 27 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, namely drawings: Site Location Plan (TQRQM20351160140680), Plan View (6513H 00 Rev 03), Proposed Site and Ground Floor Plan (CM214-21-1013) and Proposed Elevations (CM214-21-1014).

Preliminary Matters

2. The development for which planning permission is sought was described on the application form as "the project involves the installation of two blast chill units to the rear elevation, connecting to the existing building, of the Kerry Foods, Noon production factory known as Spurway Foods. This facility is located at Auriol Drive, Greenford UB6 0TP". However, in the formal decision, I have used the description given on the appeal form as it is a more precise and accurate reflection of the development for which permission is sought.
3. The appeal is against the non-determination of a planning application. The Council has not expressed whether they would have granted or refused planning permission. In addition, I have not been provided with any local planning policies. Therefore, my decision is based on the evidence before me, and I will determine the appeal against the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
4. I noted on my site visit that the development had been carried out and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The available evidence only points to the matter of parking. Thus, the main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety, having regard to on-site parking.

Reasons

6. The appeal relates to a manufacturing and office building within an existing business park. The scheme proposes an extension to accommodate two chiller units within the car park.
7. I understand that the Council requested a car park management plan (CPMP). The CPMP has been submitted with the appeal and there is no information before me to suggest that the Council objected to this document. The CPMP suggests that 2 parking spaces would be lost to accommodate the development and the operator has leased an additional 10 parking spaces.
8. On my site visit I observed that the scheme results in slightly more than 2 parking spaces being removed due to the chiller units occupying part of the parking space adjacent to the cycle parking. In addition, I noted that part of the car park was being used for storage, including lorry trailers, and the building had been extended to the side. Therefore, the total number of parking spaces is less than that set out in the CPMP.
9. Nonetheless, even though the CPMP is not wholly accurate, the proposal alone does not have a significant impact upon the number of parking spaces. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the minor reduction in parking spaces has an unacceptable impact on highway safety and I saw nothing at my site visit to indicate otherwise.
10. For these reasons, the development does not have an unacceptable effect on highway safety, having regard to on-site parking. Accordingly, it accords with paragraph 111 of the Framework which states that developments should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Conditions

11. No planning conditions have been suggested by the Council. As the scheme is retrospective, I have set out within my formal decision that it shall be carried out in accordance with the plans submitted with it. Given the scale of the development and the small reduction in parking spaces, based on the information before me, I do not consider that any further conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal succeeds.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR