

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2017

by C J Ball DArch DCons RIBA IHBC

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

Decision date: 25 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K5030/Z/16/3156570
o/s 6 Bishopsgate, London EC2N 4DA

- 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 JCDecaux UK Ltd against the decision of the City of London Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00258/ADVT, dated 16 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated advertisement on a bus shelter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisement as applied for. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:-
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 1,200 cd/sq m during daylight hours, and no greater than 600 cd/sq m during the hours of darkness, to accord with the recommendations of the ILP publication 'PLG05 The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements' (2015).
 - 2) The advertisement shall display no special visual effects of any kind during the time that the advertisement is displayed or on transition between advertisements. The displayed image shall not include animated, flashing, scrolling, intermittent or video elements and the transition between successive images shall not include fading, swiping or other animated transition method. There shall be no sequencing of messages relating to the same product.
 - 3) The minimum time between successive displayed images shall be 10 seconds and the transition shall take place over a period not exceeding 1 second.

Main issues

2. The effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area and its impact on public safety.

Reasons

3. The internally illuminated double sided LCD screen advertisement would be a freestanding but integral part of a new bus shelter, of a high standard of design. It would replace the existing roadside shelter on the wide pavement along the eastern side of Bishopsgate, to the north of its junction with
-

Leadenhall Street, in front of a range of modern office blocks. Across the wide carriageway lies the Bank Conservation Area. I saw that, while the trees behind it are an attractive townscape feature, the site itself makes no positive contribution to the setting of the conservation area.

4. Across the street lies a series of grade II listed buildings: 1-2, 7-9, 13-15 Bishopsgate and 37-38 Threadneedle Street, a grand sweeping range of former bank buildings. The site lies within the wider street setting of these listed buildings but, because of its location across the road, adjacent to a group of modern buildings, and its distance from the listed buildings, the site makes no real contribution to the quality of their setting or to their significance as heritage assets.
5. The immediate neighbourhood of the site is characterised by modern office development alongside a busy commercial thoroughfare, with a variety of street furniture. Redevelopment is taking place nearby, which is likely to consolidate the commercial character of the immediate area. The existing trees would remain, providing an attractive backdrop to the shelter. I consider that the proposed advertisement would be in scale and in keeping with these characteristics, so that it would not be out of place in its surroundings. The advertisement screen might obscure some narrow views of the sweep of bank buildings but, generally, the ability to appreciate them in their setting would not be significantly reduced. The advertisement would not therefore be prominent in views from the conservation area or harm the significance of the listed buildings.
6. The maximum level of screen illuminance indicated would be more than twice the level recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP). That level of brightness could make the advertisement overly dominant within the street scene, particularly at night. However, the levels of brightness can be limited by condition to meet ILP standards and, with that in mind, I do not consider that the advertisement would be so obtrusive or predominant in this particular location that it would undermine the restrained and dignified character of the City.
7. With regard to public safety, the advertisement would be no wider than the existing shelter structure so that it would not particularly affect the free flow of pedestrians along the wide pavement. While the advertisement structure would be opaque, resulting in the loss of some degree of natural surveillance from one direction, the shelter would be open in other directions so that it would not hamper the safe passage of pedestrians.
8. The screens would show a range of displays in sequence and also appear to be capable of showing moving images. To avoid being overly eye-catching to drivers, the images should remain static for reasonably long periods and change quickly, while moving images at the roadside would be particularly distracting and dangerous. That can be controlled by condition and, subject to that condition, I consider that the advertisement would not be a danger to highway users.
9. The Council refers me to a recent decision at 59 Cornhill nearby¹. That relates to a full scale, 3 storey scaffolding shroud, incorporating a large illuminated advertising panel. Unlike here, the site is an integral part of the setting of a

¹ APP/K5030/H/16/3142331

notable building so that, in type and location, the considerations in that case are not comparable and offer no convincing precedent for this case.

10. I have taken account of the Council's Local Plan policies aimed at controlling advertisements, safeguarding heritage assets and protecting public safety but I find no overriding conflict with these policies. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity and public safety.

Colin Ball

Inspector