



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2026

by Laura Cuthbert BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/25/3374652

24-26 Spring Street, London W2 1JA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Nando's Chickenland Ltd against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 25/04962/ADFULL sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 4 of a planning permission Ref 25/02998/FULL, granted on 28 June 2025.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 12 August 2025.
The development proposed is Replacement shopfront. (Linked with 25/02999/ADV).
 - The details for which approval is sought are: Details drawings of the left hand bay pursuant to condition 4 of planning permission dated 27 June 2025 (RN: 25/02998/FULL) as outlined on drawing nos GA Ground Floor Plan (drawing ref. (01)001_C); • Proposed Elevation 1 (drawing ref. (01)100_D); and • Proposed Elevation 2 (drawing ref. (01)101_D).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and the details submitted pursuant to condition No 4 attached to planning permission Ref 25/02998/FULL granted on 28 June 2025 in accordance with the application dated 17 July 2025 and the details submitted with it, namely drawing nos GA Ground Floor Plan (drawing ref. (01)001_C); Proposed Elevation 1 (drawing ref. (01)100_D); and Proposed Elevation 2 (drawing ref. (01)101_D), are approved.

Preliminary Matters

2. I carried out my site visit in January 2026. Following the visit, I was advised that, due to a cyber-attack, the Council had been unable to process appeals. These issues have now been resolved, and I have since received the Council's Statement of Case. I am therefore now in a position to determine the appeal.
3. The shopfront details submitted by the appellant to discharge condition 4 have already been implemented on site and accord with the shopfront design shown on the proposed plans. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the submitted details are satisfactory to discharge Condition No. 4, having regard to their effect on the character and appearance of the area, including whether they preserve the significance of the Bayswater Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a commercial premises at 24–26 Spring Street, formed of adjoining late 19th-century, three-storey terraced buildings. The ground floor contains a shared shopfront with a return to Conduit Place, while the upper floors feature decorative sash windows with stucco detailing. The remainder of Spring Street includes retail, restaurants, public houses and estate agents at ground floor level with residential uses above.
6. The site lies within the Bayswater Conservation Area (CA), which is predominantly characterised by 19th-century terraces of consistent proportions, strong architectural rhythm, including vertical pilasters, and high-quality detailing, accommodating a mix of residential and commercial uses. My site visit confirmed this description to be generally accurate. There are many listed properties in the wider locality, including Paddington Underground Station. Nos 24–26, and the terrace in which they sit, contribute positively to the significance of the CA, which for the purposes of this appeal, derives from its historic architectural interest and coherent townscape.
7. The Council identifies that although unlisted, Nos 24-26 are regarded as non-designated heritage assets under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), given their age, architectural quality, and contribution to the streetscape. As this is not disputed by the appellant, I consider them to be non-designated heritage assets of moderate significance.
8. I note from the planning history that earlier applications¹ for shopfront alterations and associated advertisements were refused, with the treatment of the left-hand bay identified as the principal design concern.
9. The subsequent approved scheme, to which the disputed condition relates, retained a solid form in this location. However, the Council accepted that the matter could be addressed by condition. Condition 4 therefore required the submission of revised shopfront details, including the provision of a traditional timber and glazed frontage to the left-hand bay, consistent with the approved bays to the right (with glazing capable of being obscured if necessary).
10. The shopfront design as shown in the submitted details and consequently as implemented, represents a clear improvement on the previously proposed solid frontage, particularly through the introduction of a largely glazed elevation which reduces visual bulk and creates a more active street presence.
11. The inclusion of the sub-pilaster reflects the established vertical rhythm and articulation of the terrace, where such features are a defining characteristic. It is slightly wider than the other sub-pilasters, more akin in width to those positioned between properties that typically support party walls at upper storey level. However, the treatment of the left-hand bay integrates satisfactorily with the wider shopfront, resulting in a visually coherent frontage. The column and glazing reflect the proportions and character of the overall design, while also accommodating structural and operational requirements, including maintaining an uninterrupted cookline. I also note that this part of the shopfront has historically accommodated an infill panel, lending further support to the acceptability of the shopfront design.

¹ Planning Application Refs 25/00486/FULL and 25/00487/ADV, refused 3 April 2025,

As such, it does not appear as incongruous when considered within the overall shopfront composition.

12. In terms of detailing, any differences between the new elements and the original pilasters are limited, partly due to their consistent black finish. When viewed in the context of the commercial shopfront as a whole, any differences are not unduly prominent or harmful to the streetscene or the wider CA. The prominence of the ground floor, by virtue of its position adjacent to the pavement, does not in itself result in harm, and the shopfront design responds appropriately to the host building and surrounding townscape.
13. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the shopfront design appears as proportionate and appropriately integrated with the host building. It maintains the established character and appearance of the terrace and preserves the significance of the Bayswater CA, and the significance of the non-designated heritage assets of moderate significance. As such, I conclude that the shopfront design preserves the character and appearance of the area and satisfies the statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
14. For similar reasons, the shopfront design does not conflict with Policies 38, 39 and 40 of the City Plan 2019-2040 (adopted April 2021). Together these policies seek high-quality and sensitive design, having regard to the prevailing character, materials, architectural quality and degree of uniformity. Development within conservation areas should preserve or enhance their character and appearance, conserving heritage assets in a manner proportionate to their significance. Positive features, including unlisted buildings that contribute positively, should be retained, with opportunities taken to secure enhancements where possible.
15. The Council cite conflict with the advice contained in the 'Shopfronts, Blinds and Signs' design guide (adopted 1993). However, no specific element of the design guide has been identified with which the proposed shopfront conflicts. In any event, having found the details to be acceptable, the shopfront design is considered to accord with the underlying objectives of the guidance, which makes clear that its purpose is not to prescribe precise approaches to shopfront design or to discourage imaginative solutions, but rather to provide general guidance for the alteration, replacement and restoration of shopfronts.

Conclusion

16. Based on the evidence before me, for the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that the details submitted in relation to the left-hand bay, pursuant to condition 4 of planning permission Ref. 25/02998/FULL, are acceptable. Accordingly, the condition can be discharged, and the appeal is allowed.

Laura Cuthbert

INSPECTOR