



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/H/17/3169608

Outside of 325 Woolwich Road, Greenwich, London SE7

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against conditions imposed when granting express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Insite Poster Properties Ltd against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/3998/A, dated 2 December 2016, for replacement of existing 96 sheet advertising display with 48 sheet internally-illuminated display, was granted consent by the Council on 7 February 2017.
 - The condition in dispute is No 4 which states that: *The advertisement consent hereby granted shall expire at the end of 5 years from the date of this consent. At expiry of the advertising consent, the advertising signage hereby approved shall be removed from the subject site and the site reinstated to a good order, to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*
 - The reason given for the condition is to: *To safeguard future growth requirements within the Royal Borough of Greenwich. The subject site is within an area identified for future development under the Policies EA3 and E(a) Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the advertisement consent Ref 16/3998/A for replacement of existing 96 sheet advertising display with 48 sheet internally-illuminated display at Outside of 325 Woolwich Road, Greenwich, London SE7 granted on 7 February 2017 by Royal Borough of Greenwich Council is varied by deleting condition 4 and substituting for it the following condition:

4) The express consent hereby granted shall be for a period of 5 years.

Procedural Matter

2. There are some inconsistencies between the site address details and the description of the type of advertisement proposed as given on the application form and as stated on the Council's decision notice. I have used the wording from the latter in my decision to ensure consistency with the terms of the express consent.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the condition in dispute is necessary in the interests of amenity and public safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an existing 96 sheet advertising display which I saw was located adjacent to a busy road junction against a backdrop of a mixture of utility, industrial and commercial uses. The 48-sheet internally-illuminated digital LED display, for which the Council has granted express advertisement consent, would replace this existing advertisement.
5. The disputed condition would enforce the removal of the proposed advertisement and the reinstatement of the site. The appellant states that no relevant reasons have been provided why the removal of the advertisement and discontinuance on expiry of the consent is either necessary or desirable. I have also had regard to the Planning Practice Guidance¹ which states that if a local planning authority decides to impose conditions that are additional to the standard conditions, these must be supported by specific and relevant planning reasons. Subsequent to their decision, the Council has confirmed that, after further consideration, it considers that this condition is unreasonable.
6. In the absence of substantive evidence that the condition is necessary in the interests of amenity and public safety, and based on my observations on my site visit, I conclude that the disputed condition is neither reasonable nor necessary. The appeal is allowed and express consent varied to remove the disputed condition and to substitute for it a new condition.

David Cross

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph: 034 Reference ID: 18b-034-20140306