
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2016

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Z/16/3153163

122 Peckham High Street, Southwark, London SE15 5ED

- 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 Mr Tony Dunseath (Clear Channel UK Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/1001, dated 16 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as "Screening banner to surround the existing advertisement display which benefits from express consent, to screen unattractive gable".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, with particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rye Lane Conservation Area.

Procedural Matters

3. The Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework both make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. Whilst the Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers relevant to this appeal, and I have taken them into account as a material consideration, the Council's policies have not, by themselves, been decisive.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is the flank wall of a four-storey end of terrace building on a prominent corner at the junction with Peckham High Street and an entrance to the adjacent bus depot. The building has a traditional brick facade with stone detailing, whilst the flank wall is simply rendered. The architectural vernacular of the host building is typical of the area and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Rye Lane Conservation Area (CA), a designated heritage asset.
5. Broadly in the centre of the flank wall is an existing advertisement display approximately 5m wide by 7.5m high. The advertisement is relatively small in

comparison with the flank wall, so that on the whole it appears subservient to the appeal building.

6. The proposal is to erect a screen banner that would surround the existing advertisement, covering broadly what is left of the flank wall. The appellant has provided a photo visualisation which shows the screen banner adorned with an example logo which is the same as that displayed in the central advertisement.
7. The proposed screen banner, as shown in the appellant's submissions, would be viewed together with the existing advertisement so that these two features would appear as a single large advertisement encompassing the whole of the flank wall.
8. The excessive size of the screen banner, in conjunction with the existing advertisement, would dominate the flank wall appearing significantly out of scale with the host building, unacceptably harming its appearance and that of the wider area. This harm would be particularly pronounced due to the screen banner's height and prominent corner position.
9. As far as such factors are material, the advertisement is therefore contrary to policy 12 of the Council's Core Strategy (2011), which seeks to ensure that development preserve or enhance Southwark's historic environment, including conservation areas.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, and thus would be detrimental to the interests of visual amenity. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Oliver Blower

Appointed Person