

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/Z/17/3175994

12 Chatsworth Road, Hackney, London E5 0LP

- 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 Richard Page of Insite Poster Properties Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Hackney
 - The application Ref 2017/0326, dated 24 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is 'replacement of an existing 48 sheet advertising display with a 48 sheet backlit display'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The National Planning Policy Framework states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. No issues have been raised in relation to public safety in this appeal. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed display on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Chatsworth Road Local Shopping Centre which contains a variety of retail and commercial premises, some with residential accommodation at first floor. The existing poster display is located above a commercial unit occupying a corner site at the junction of Chatsworth Road and Clifden Road. Two smaller commercial units are located to the rear of the appeal premises facing onto Clifden Road with residential properties further to the east.
 4. By reason of its size, corner location and elevated position, the existing display is prominent and highly visible when approaching along Chatsworth Road from the north and when viewed from the area around the Chatsworth Road/Clifden Road crossroads.
 5. As a replacement, the display would not result in additional signage or clutter within the street scene. However, whilst the display would cover the same area as the existing installation, the depth of the frame would increase from 150mm to 450mm to accommodate lighting equipment. The hoarding would project further from the gable wall of the building resulting in a more bulky and
-

- prominent appearance compared with the existing timber framed poster display.
6. There is a variety of existing signage in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site including other advertisement hoardings. However, illuminated signage is predominantly associated with internal and external illumination of shop fascias and projecting signs at fascia level. Due to its height, the proposed display would be viewed in isolation from these sources, increasing its prominence.
 7. The combined effect of the elevated position, bulky appearance and illumination of the proposed display would 'draw the eye' and would be visually intrusive in the street scene. Notwithstanding the commercial character of the area and the presence of other light sources including street lights, it would have an unduly harsh and imposing appearance which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. The aim to improve the condition of the installation and prevent the deterioration of its paper displays is a positive aspect of the proposal and I recognise that the level of illumination could be controlled by means of a planning condition. However, these considerations do not outweigh or overcome the harm identified in relation to the main issue in this case.
 9. The Council has referred to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy 24 of the Hackney Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and Policies DM1 and DM29 of the Hackney Development Management Local Plan (2015) (LP) which indicate that advertisements should be sensitive to the character of an area and should not detract from the amenity of the street scene. Whilst not determinative, I have taken these policies into account as a material factor noting that the signs would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the proposed display would be detrimental to visual amenity and the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR