

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by P Eggleton Bsc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/Z/16/3153777

McDonald's Restaurant, 84 Putney High Street, London SW15 1RB

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by McDonald's Restaurants Ltd against the decision of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1506, dated 16 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is a high level banner sign with internally illuminated golden arch on non-illuminated khaki green background.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

1. The proposal would result in a high level banner aligned with the second floor windows of this building. The restaurant has a frontage at ground level which currently benefits from a fascia sign and a low level projecting sign.
 2. The host building is part of a distinctive terrace which now accommodates six ground floor commercial units. Some of the original detailing associated with the shop fronts remain but generally, the units have been substantially modified and contain differing detailing and signage. All the signage is however below the first floor level. Above the ground floor the building has retained its original detailing and character and is uninterrupted, except for a number of satellite dishes, external lights and other minor additions. As a single new element, the proposed advertisement would compete with and detract from the distinctive and unified appearance of this terrace.
 3. As this terrace is set back, the gable of the neighbouring property is exposed. This accommodates a large sign advertising the Putney Exchange and its car park. Although not a positive feature within the street scene, it is set against the gable and therefore it does not detract from the building's frontage. The proposed advert would be viewed in association with this existing sign and this combination of advertising would detract further from the uncluttered appearance of the building.
-

4. I acknowledge that the Putney Exchange includes large banner adverts. These are designed to reflect and complement its contemporary character and appearance. This would not be the case with the proposal before me. There is also a high level banner sign on the end of the adjacent terrace. I find some similarities with the appeal advertisement although that banner is located beyond the original building, on a more modern addition and on the corner. It therefore represents a single new element but in an individual location that does not compete with the architectural interest of the original terrace.
5. I found there to be several three and four storey terraces within the High Street and although their architectural details differ, they individually present unified frontages to the street, at the upper levels. Generally, with regard to these, I found there to be no advertising above the ground floor. They represent distinctive features of the wider area and allowing a new, single advert that would break up the unity of this terrace, would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
6. The Regulations, the *National Planning Policy Framework* and the *Planning Practice Guidance* require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety and therefore, the Council's policies cannot be decisive. However, I have taken them into account as material considerations. Given my concerns, I find that the proposal would be contrary to the general design objectives of Policy DMS1 of the Development Management Policies Document 2016 and the specific advertisement requirements of Policy DMS8. The *Framework* is clear that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built environment and I find that this would be the case with regard to this proposal.
7. I have had regard to the matters put forward by the appellant. I appreciate that there is restricted visibility of the restaurant when approaching from the north. A banner sign in the position shown would increase its visibility. Although the repositioning of the lower banner sign would also offer benefits in this regard, this is a matter that weighs in favour of the proposal. I also afford weight to the support offered to businesses by the *Framework*. Overall, although there are some matters that weigh in favour of the proposal, they do not outweigh my concerns. I therefore conclude that the appeal must be dismissed in the interests of amenity.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR