
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 4 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/Z/17/3168497
88-90 Lillie Road, London SW6 7SR

- 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 Kingsland Estates Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/04722/ADV dated 27 October 2016 was refused by notice dated 8 December 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is 2 no temporary advertisement banners on a scaffold shroud.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact of the proposed advertisement shroud on:
 - The character and appearance of the area and its visual amenity
 - Public safety

Reasons

3. Powers to regulate advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety. I am aware of and have considered the Hammersmith and Fulham Council 2011 Core Strategy Policy BE1 and the 2013 Development Management Local Plan Policies G7, G8 and J6 and its 2013 Supplementary Planning Document insofar as they are material to my determination of this matter.
 4. The site fronts onto the junction at Lillie Road/North End Road, where streams of traffic intersect along its arterial roads at a busy double mini roundabout. The building itself is on the local register of Buildings of Merit. A shroud would be erected on scaffolding during the course of works to the building, and externally lit. The display would be a facsimile of the buildings appearance, whilst including advertising panels.
 5. There is evidence about the accident record at the junction that indicates that there are grounds for resisting the display on the grounds of public safety, particularly due to its location on the corner. There is also a Highways objection. I note the accident rates at this location, and I conclude that the
-

addition of further distractions or intrusions would have a potentially serious impact, and unacceptably compromise public safety.

6. The area is busy and commercialised, with shops and other similar premises, including the betting shops with their large fascias. However, no other advertisement forms so much of the bulk of the building, or is so dominant or large. Consequently, I consider that this would be visually prominent and would detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the area.
7. I accept that advertising revenue might contribute to the costs of the works, and that the shroud would in part replicate the buildings appearance and not consist completely of advertising, which might mitigate its visual effect. It might have benefits in protecting people renovating the frontage, but I have insufficient information about the external works to justify that, or the shroud being in place for almost a year on that basis. In any event, the concerns about public safety and its effect on local visual amenity are grounds to justify its refusal.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and with regard to all other matters, I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity and public safety, and the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR