



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2017

by Timothy C King BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/16/3161715

Land at Novotel London Brentford, Great West Road, Brentford, TW8 0GP

- 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 BDW Trading Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/P/AD43, dated 21 July 2016, was determined by notice dated 16 September 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is a display measuring 7.5m x 5m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not raised any objection to the proposed display in terms of public safety and, as such, the main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on local amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, comprising a small section of the Novotel Hotel car park, sits adjacent to the A4 Great West Road which, in turn, is bounded by the elevated section of the M4. The proposal is to erect a bespoke, curved structure which would incorporate a double-sided LED display measuring some 5m x 7.5m. The structure would rise to a height exceeding 23m whilst the base of the display itself would be approximately 10.7m from ground level which would also be some 2.1m above the elevated section of the M4.
 4. The Council, in refusing express consent, considered that the proposal would impact on the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings, including the nearby Wallis House, a Grade II listed building. It also considered that the amenities of residents occupying the Kew Eye Apartments block, situated south of the site, would be harmed.
 5. Firstly, in respect of the proposal's effect on Wallis House, I disagree with the Council's assessment. This building is sited some 115m eastwards along the A4 and is separated from the Novotel site by a multi-storey office block spanning a width of almost 70m. Such a distance, and when also factoring in the M4 elevation, does not convince me that the proposal, in such a context, would have any significant effect on the listed building's setting.
 6. To my mind the overwhelming consideration is not the visual clutter mentioned by the Council but, instead, the sheer scale of the proposed structure relative
-

to its immediate surroundings. Although of considerable height the curved structure itself is shown to be quite slim but this would be offset by the substantial 5m wide digital display panel which would tower over the elevated roadway, appearing so prominent as to represent a visual imposition.

7. In this connection I have had regard to Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that advertisements are appropriate for their setting, and advises that they should not have a negative impact on either the built or natural environment. This advice is reflected in Policy CC5 of the Council's Local Plan which, amongst other things, indicates that advertisements and their associated structures are of a size, design and scale that is compatible with their surroundings and do not appear unduly obtrusive or unduly dominant on the skyline.
8. From my findings the proposal is in conflict with Policy CC5. Further, the Kew Eye Apartments block has certain upper floor flats which would look towards the display's west facing panel. Despite the appellant's contrary view I consider that the display panel's size and prominence, despite the intended splay angle, would hold implications for the outlook and amenities of existing and future residential occupiers thereto. In this respect I am not convinced that the proposal has given sufficient consideration to local amenity.
9. I have had regard to the local policies cited in the Council's decision notice and, although these have not been the only considerations, I find that the proposed signage is contrary to their respective aims and also relevant advice within the Framework.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. The appeal, therefore, does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR