
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/16/3164046

Telephone Kiosk outside 641 High Road, Tottenham, London N17 8AA

- 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 Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/2844, dated 22 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated digital panel as integral part of telephone kiosk.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent for the display of the advertisement as applied for is granted. 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.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the site address from that given on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form. However for the avoidance of doubt, the kiosk would be situated directly opposite the front of No 643 High Road.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site, situated on High Road, is within the North Tottenham Conservation Area. The character of the surrounding area is one of mixed retail and commercial uses at ground floor level with upper floor residential use along a wide tree-lined street. I noted during my visit that the area had a busy and vibrant feel, with continuous streams of pedestrians and traffic passing the site.
 5. The proposed advertisement, which would be accommodated within an integral panel in the rear of the kiosk, would take the form of a sequence of digital images, changing at ten second intervals via a so-called smooth fade transition.
-

6. The advertisement would be viewed in the context of signage in a variety of colours and designs associated with the adjacent ground floor commercial units. In addition there is a bus shelter opposite the site which incorporates large advertisement panels. It would form part of a new telephone kiosk of contemporary appearance, which is proposed to replace an existing adjacent kiosk, and would read as a typical form of street furniture along a busy and wide commercial road. Furthermore the generous width of the footway and adjacent road means that the relatively limited dimensions of the proposal would not be seen to dominate or clutter its immediate surroundings.
7. The changing imagery of the advertisement, in the context of the fluidity of pedestrian and vehicle movement along High Road, and the level of illumination, which would be responsive to changing levels of ambient light and in an area that would be subject to other sources of light such as from traffic and street lighting, would not appear out of character with its surroundings. Furthermore, I note there is no dispute between the parties that the maximum level of night time illumination, at 280 cd/m², would be within Institute of Lighting Professionals guideline recommendations for such installations.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would not be an incongruous addition to the street scene. Consequently there would be no significant harm to the visual amenity of the area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.
9. Accordingly I find no conflict with Policy UD10 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 or Policy DM3 of the Council's emerging Development Management Development Plan Document. These policies seek for signage to be of high quality design and to avoid loss of amenity through clutter and visual intrusion. Furthermore I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it seeks to control advertisements in the interests of amenity whilst taking account of cumulative impacts.
10. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is allowed. In doing so I note that no non-standard conditions have been proposed and I consider that none are necessary.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR