

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 June 2017

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5090/Z/17/3173278

308 Woodhouse Road, North Finchley, London N12 0LH

- 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 Singer (Austin Chambers & Co) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/8018/ADV, dated 16 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is a wall mounted 48 sheet advertising poster panel (Dimensions: 3.048m x 6.096m) fixed to the East Elevation.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5090/Z/17/3173285

308 Woodhouse Road, North Finchley, London N12 0LH

- 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 Singer (Austin Chambers & Co) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/8020/ADV, dated 16 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is a wall mounted 48 sheet advertising poster panel (Dimensions: 3.048m x 6.096m) fixed to the West Elevation.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5090/Z/17/3173278

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for a wall mounted 48 sheet advertising poster panel (Dimensions: 3.048m x 6.096m) fixed to the East Elevation at 308 Woodhouse Road, North Finchley, London N12 0LH, as applied for. The consent is granted for a period of five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5090/Z/17/3173285

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for a wall mounted 48 sheet advertising poster panel (Dimensions: 3.048m x 6.096m) fixed to the West Elevation at 308 Woodhouse Road, North Finchley, London N12 0LH, as applied for. The consent is granted for a period of five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.
-

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to the same property, to the same type and size of advertisement and the Council's reason for refusal is the same in each case. Consequently, due to these similarities, I have considered both appeals together, drawing attention to any distinctions between the different positions of the proposed advertisements on the appeal building where necessary.
4. The main parties refer to earlier refused applications for similar but smaller advertisements in the same position on the appeal building (reference 16/6003/ADV and 16/6004/ADV). While I note these other proposals, I am unaware of all the details and, in any case, these appeals involve separate proposals which I have considered on their own merits.

Main Issue

5. The main issue with regard to both appeals is the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. No 308 is a three storey building on the southern side of Woodhouse Road, with a foodstore on the ground floor and residential units on the upper floors. It is located in the Friern Barnet Local Centre, which includes a range of small retail and commercial units at ground floor with mainly residential use above. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.
7. The poster panel advertisements would be positioned on the upper part of the east and west-facing gable walls of the appeal building. There are no other examples of this type of advertisement within the local centre as the predominant form is fascia signs above ground floor units and some free-standing street-side signs or those attached to bus shelters.
8. Given that the proposals are within a designated centre where commercial uses and associated advertising are commonplace, the principle of these further advertisements within the centre is acceptable. I disagree, however, with the appellant's assessment that the proposals should be read in a wider context of other centres and similar forms of advertisements along Woodhouse Road. The local centre is self-contained and well-separated from other commercial uses. As such, the effects of the proposed advertisements should be assessed against the amenity of the local centre and its immediate surroundings.
9. The appeal building is the tallest within the local centre and the advertisements' proposed positions are typical of the use of side gables for advertising within such centres. As such, the proposed panels would not appear incongruous or otherwise unusual in this position. The panels at either end of the building would be of a proportionate size to the scale of the large side walls. This, together with the elevated position above the ground floor advertising, would ensure that the addition of these advertisements would not give a cluttered appearance to the building or local centre. Moreover, each panel would be seen in isolation from the other given their position.
10. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the amenity of the host building and surrounding area. I have taken into account Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies

DPD 2012, which concerns the protection of Barnet's character and amenity and which, therefore, is material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposals would not harm amenity, they do not conflict with this policy. Consequently, the appeals should succeed.

Conditions

11. As advertisements are involved the consents should be subject to the five standard conditions included in the 2007 Regulations; and the period of the consents is five years, as is usual and applied for in each case.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR