
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/Z/17/3176576

Premier Inn, Alan Pullinger Centre, 1 John Bradshaw Road, Southgate, London N14 6BT

- 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 Whitbread Group (Kathryn Mear) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00782/ADV, dated 22 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed the installation of 1 x internally illuminated fascia sign, 1 x non illuminated fascia sign, 1 x internally illuminated projecting sign and 1 x non illuminated double sided post mounted directional sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1 x internally illuminated fascia sign, 1 x non illuminated fascia sign, 1 x internally illuminated projecting sign and 1 x non illuminated double sided post mounted directional sign as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form describes the site address as John Bradshaw Road, N14 6BN. However, the Council's decision notice, the appeal form and the appellant's statement give fuller versions of the address which I have used in the header and paragraph 1 above. Similarly, I have taken the description of the advertisements from those documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area, including the settings of Southgate Circus Conservation Area and the Grade II* listed Southgate Station.

Reasons

4. Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built environment. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that factors relevant to visual amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural interest¹.

¹ Paragraph reference ID: 18b-079-20140306

5. The advertisement would be placed or adjoining a six storey hotel which was under construction at the time of my site visit. The hotel abuts an existing four storey office and car park and is located to the rear a six storey office building which fronts onto the High Street. The buildings opposite the proposed advertisements, whilst smaller in scale, are modern in appearance and there is nothing to suggest that they are of particular architectural merit. I also note that there are signs for the Alan Pullinger Centre along John Bradshaw Road. The immediate setting for the signs is, therefore, fairly robust and commercial in character.
6. The fascia and projecting signs would sit comfortably within the architectural features of the hotel and no more than two would be placed on any elevation. The free standing sign would be logically positioned at the approach to a car parking area. Therefore, I consider that the proposed advertisements would not result in visual clutter and that their design would be unacceptable. There is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed levels of illumination would harm visual amenity.
7. The Southgate Circus Conservation Area is centred on the listed Southgate Station and adjoining listed Station Parade, but extends south along High Street almost to its junction with John Bradshaw Road. There would be inter-visibility between part of the Conservation Area and the proposed advertisements. The illuminated projecting sign on the southern elevation of the hotel in particular would be clearly seen in views from the High Street. However, given the scale and character of the building on which the sign would be placed, I consider that it would not appear disproportionately large or excessively high in this view. Moreover, all of the proposed advertisements would be set back from the Conservation Area boundary by a considerable distance behind large scale commercial buildings and other signage. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that this intervening area contributes to significance of the heritage asset. As such, I consider that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the setting of the Conservation Area.
8. There would be no inter-visibility between Southgate Station or other listed buildings and the proposed signs. The setting of a listed building can also include areas with a historical, social or economic association with the heritage asset. However, in this case, there is nothing to suggest the area in which the proposed advertisements would be located contributes to the significance of the listed buildings. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the setting of the listed buildings.
9. I have taken into account Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies 30 and 31 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies DMD37, DMD 41 and DMD44 of its Development Management Document to the extent that they seek to protect amenity and heritage assets and so are material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal would not conflict with these policies.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR