
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/16/3167722

Conway Site and Weighbridge, North Hyde Gardens, Bulls Bridge, Hayes UB3 4QQ

- 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 FM Conway Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 13226/ADV/2016/84, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
 - The advertisements proposed are 4 LED sequential static displays (5000mm x 7500mm) on freestanding poles.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent for the display of the advertisements 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 in addition to the non-standard conditions set out below.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, off North Hyde Gardens, forms part of an extensive industrial and commercial landscape which is characterised by very large and bulky buildings and plant, surrounded by open storage spaces. The A312 road, otherwise known as The Parkway, passes through this area in a north-south direction. The road is elevated to enable it to cross over the Grand Union Canal and Great Western Railway line.
 4. The advertisements would be relatively large in scale and constructed on tall freestanding poles, fixed to land immediately adjacent to either side of The Parkway. They would project above the height of this road at its most elevated point and would therefore be clearly visible to approaching traffic.
 5. Although the full height of the structures including mounting poles would be visible from the public realm along North Hyde Gardens, this experience would be limited by the absence of through traffic and pedestrians given that the road ends a short distance further to the east.
-

6. Viewed from the elevated road level, the advertisements, because of their scale, intrusion into the skyline and use of sequential digital images, would draw the eye as very prominent features. Notwithstanding this, the proposal would add an element of colour and visual interest to what would otherwise be a journey through relatively mundane surroundings. Furthermore the signage would not appear excessively imposing or incongruous in the context of the established surrounding massive forms of industrial infrastructure that already dominate this area. It was also evident that a large digital sign is already in place further to the north along The Parkway. The proposal would not therefore appear as an unfamiliar feature along the highway, whilst being sufficiently far away from the existing sign not to result in a sense of clutter. I note that there is no specific objection in terms of the level of illumination proposed.
7. Concern has been raised by a third party regarding the impact of the proposal on various features, including the Bulls Bridge Conservation Area (CA). It is also apparent that the Bulls Bridge itself, crossing the Grand Union Canal is a Grade II listed building (LB). I have been provided with very limited information regarding these features, however from my visit it seemed to me that the setting of the LB, due to the presence of nearby industrial land and buildings, was confined to adjacent canal footways. The appeal site would therefore be too far away for the proposal to cause harm to the setting of this structure. Similarly, from the evidence before me and my visit, the net impact of the proposal on the visual amenity of the CA, given the context of the existing industrial surroundings, would be negligible.
8. In addition the advertisements would be sufficiently far away from the Minet Country Park to the north and Cranford Park to the south to ensure that there would be no material impact on the visual amenities of these areas.
9. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the visual amenity of the area. Accordingly I find no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policy BE27 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012. These policies seek to secure high quality design appropriate to the identity and context of its surroundings. 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 have applied the Council's suggested non-standard conditions, to which the appellant raises no objection, regarding the illumination, presentation and transition of images and to ensure the carriageway and footway are kept clear of any obstructions in the interests of highway safety.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF NON-STANDARD CONDITIONS

1. The maximum luminance of the panels shall not exceed 300cd per square metre during the hours of darkness.
2. The panels shall not display any form of moving, apparently moving or flashing image.
3. The sequential advertisements shall not change more frequently than once every ten seconds.
4. The sequential change between advertisements shall take place over a period of no greater than one second.
5. During construction and maintenance of the panels, no part of any plant or vehicle or other structure shall obstruct the A312 footway and carriageway which shall remain open and clear at all times.