
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by Claire Victory BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/16/3159106

Telephone Kiosk outside No. 128 Cranbrook Road, Ilford EG1 4LZ

- 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 Matthew Coe (New World Payphones) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2355/16, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated panel as integral part of telephone kiosk.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and consent is granted for the display of the advertisement as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of the decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposed replacement telephone kiosk would be in the same location as the existing kiosk. It would be situated within the footway close to the road and fronting a parade of shops within a Secondary Shopping Area, just north of Ilford Metropolitan Centre.
 4. This part of Cranbrook Road is a busy commercial area, with shops and restaurants on both sides of the road, a number of which have illuminated fascia signs. There are also two freestanding advertisements mounted on posts within the footway, one about 5 metres from the site of the kiosk and one on the other side of the road. An internally illuminated cash machine is located within a shopfront nearby. Other street furniture nearby includes a bus shelter on the opposite side of the road and a large Ilford Town Centre sign in the central refuge of the carriageway. The area is therefore characterised by commercial uses which operate both in the daytime and evening, where one would expect to see illuminated signs.
 5. The illuminated panel within the kiosk would face the road, and would be less than 1 metre wide and just over 1.5 metres high. It would be smaller than the nearby pole mounted illuminated sign, and would be seen against the backdrop
-

of the adjacent commercial frontage. Accordingly, it would not be a dominant or obtrusive element within the street scene, and as the kiosk would replace an existing one, it would not lead to an overly cluttered appearance.

6. Reference has been made to development plan policies. Whilst these may be material considerations, I have determined the appeal in relation to the effect on amenity and public safety, in accordance with the regulations. With respect to the latter, no harm is alleged, and I find that no harm has been demonstrated to either amenity or public safety.
7. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Claire Victory

INSPECTOR