
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/Z/17/3174080
130 Richmond Hill, Richmond TW10 6RN

- 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 Millar of Greene King Pub Co against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/4221/ADV, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of replacement illuminated and non-illuminated signs to the exterior of the building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisement as applied for. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application was issued as a split decision by the Council and I will therefore consider only the advertisement that was refused consent which is the projecting sign (No 1). A projecting sign was in place by the time I carried out my site visit and this was in a higher position on the building than the advertisement being applied for. I will deal with the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The Council has not raised concerns about public safety. The main issue is therefore the effect of the advertisements on the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area. In considering this, I will pay special attention to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area (CA). I have also taken into account the development plan policies referred to by the Council but given the requirements of the regulations, they are not determinative in themselves.

Reasons

4. The Roebuck public house is in a prominent position along Richmond Hill within the CA which includes traditional buildings of a broad variety of styles. There are unifying elements of the building frontages elsewhere although The Roebuck has an individual appearance constructed of brown brick with simple fascia above the ground floor and with a lack of ornamentation on the first and

second floor levels when seen from the street. It is locally listed as a Building of Townscape Merit.

5. The building is within a terrace of properties which face towards the undeveloped Terrace Walk on the opposite side of the road, in a high position above Terrace Field. The strong line of trees alongside Terrace Walk break-up views of these buildings from that direction.
6. The hanging sign would be positioned centrally on the face of the building. It would not substantially obscure any of the existing features such as the windows and would not dominate the front of the building or the terrace generally. This would be modestly lit by 2 external spot-lights. The advertisement along with the other previously approved signage would not look cluttered within the street-scene.
7. I consider that the projecting sign is of an adequate size and style which compliments the appearance of the building as well as its use which is of distinctly different character from the nearby properties. Although the Council's "Shopfronts" SPD¹ generally advises that hanging signs should be at fascia level I do not consider that this is necessary in this case. The photograph of a traditional hanging sign on page 12 of the SPD shows an example where a sign above fascia level is acceptable on a traditional building. I consider that the sign in this case is also acceptable.
8. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would not harm the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area. This would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. I have taken into account Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy² and Policies DC1, HD1, and HD3 of the DMP³. These seek, amongst other things, to maintain amenity and are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies.

Conclusion

9. The Council has only suggested the standard 5 advertisement conditions set out in the Regulations which are imposed by default. I have not applied any additional conditions.
10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Harwood

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Supplementary Planning Document, Shopfronts, March 2010

² London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, April 2009