
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/16/3158817

454-456 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, London W4 5TT

- 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 Michael Prokop of Wine Food Market London Ltd. against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00248/454-456/AD1, dated 15 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of internally illuminated fascia signage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the installation of internally illuminated fascia signage as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal as set out in the Council's decision notice. This is a more concise and accurate description than that contained in the application form.
3. At the time of my site visit the fascia signage was already in place. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on the basis that it seeks to retain the existing signage.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements on the visual amenity of the area, including the Turnham Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. Nos 454 and 456 Chiswick High Road form a double fronted, four-storey, property. The building is located within a row of similar properties that form part of the main shopping street and is within the Turnham Green Conservation Area (CA).
6. The area is characterised by three and four-storey properties lining either side of Chiswick High Road. There is a mix of traditional and modern buildings that generally have commercial units on the ground floor. Whilst traditional features such as pilasters and consoles have largely been retained, the traditional fascia sign depths have significantly been altered. The marked contrast between the traditional, largely unaltered, uniform upper floors and

the variety of the ground floor commercial frontages forms part of the character and appearance of the area.

7. The Council state that there is a uniform line of adverts (fascia signs) along this stretch of High Road. However, from the observations I made during my site visit the depth of the fascia signs through this part Chiswick High Road vary considerably, particularly on the north side. Whilst the depth of the sign would be greater than the adjoining properties, when considered against the wider street frontage, I do not consider that its depth is unduly harmful. The proposed fascia sign is simple in its design having a black background, similar to other units on this row. Its height would not exceed the others in this row of shops and its lowest point would not be significantly lower than others.
8. The design of the traditional properties has a horizontal emphasis. The shop frontage lacks many of the traditional architectural details other shops have, in particular fluted pilasters and consoles. Whilst the fascia sign is deeper than a typical traditional fascia sign, the shop windows remain in proportion with the upper floor detailing. Furthermore, as it is double fronted, the width of the sign reflects the horizontal emphasis of the building.
9. I have had regard to the previous fascia sign which had a similar depth but was wider, covering three units as opposed to two. The appellant states that this advertisement was lawful, which is not disputed by the Council. The appellant also states that there is a fallback position in that the advertisements granted consent in 2016¹ only included changes to No 458 Chiswick High Road and not Nos 454-456 and therefore the previous fascia sign could be retained. However, the previous sign has already been removed and replaced. To reinstate it would likely require express advertisement consent. I therefore do not consider that it is a viable fallback position. Nevertheless, the proposed sign is significantly shorter in width than the previous sign and therefore its visual impact is less, which weighs in favour of the proposal.
10. In their reasons for refusal, the Council have cited Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and CC5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP). They have also referred to the London Borough of Hounslow Shop Front Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, the power under the 2007 Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. Accordingly, whilst I have taken account of the Council's policies, they have not, by themselves, been decisive. I do not consider that the proposal would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 or CC5 of the LP or the SPD.
11. I find therefore that the proposed fascia sign would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conditions

12. No conditions are necessary other than the standard conditions that apply to all advertisements.

¹ Council Ref 00248/454/458/AD1

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR