



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by S M Holden BSc MSc CEng MICE TPP FCIHT MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/Z/17/3180573

City Approach, 190 City Road, Islington, London EC1V 2QH

- 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 Tyndale Terrace Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2017/1589/ADV, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is an advert on a scaffold shroud.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) confirms that the issues of amenity and, where applicable, public safety, are the determining factors in advertisement appeals. The Regulations state that development plan policies alone cannot be decisive when determining cases such as this one. Nevertheless, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)¹ advises that in assessing the effect on amenity, factors such as historic, architectural or cultural features in the neighbourhood can be taken into consideration.
4. The appeal site lies within the Moorfields Conservation Area and I have therefore had regard to my statutory duty in relation to heritage assets alongside the Council's policies, the advice and guidance of the Framework and the PPG as material considerations in reaching my decision.
5. The Conservation Area is characterised by an unusual and impressive collection of late Victorian and Edwardian commercial and institutional buildings fronting City Road. Many of these have architectural merit, make use of good quality materials and have a high degree of ornament and decoration. No 190 is a six-storey building fronting City Road and which turns the corner into Bath Street. It is therefore in a very prominent position and is highly visible to traffic travelling towards Old Street station. At the time of my site visit the building was covered in scaffolding to enable the roof extension allowed on appeal to be constructed².

¹ Paragraph 079 Reference ID: 18B-79-20140306

² Council Ref: P2015/3655/FUL

6. City Road is a bustling commercial area, with existing tall buildings and others under construction. The road's width and alignment provides long views in both directions and it carries heavy volumes of traffic. However, there is a notable absence of large scale advertising, particularly above street level. Most of the advertisements which I saw on my site visit comprised fascia boards above shops and restaurants. Any larger scale advertisement boards appeared to be confined to sites on the northern side of the road and outside the Conservation Area.
7. The proposal seeks to include a large advertisement within a scaffolding shroud which would wrap around the corner of the building. It would be highly visible to anyone travelling east along City Road where its size, scale and night-time illumination would dominate the street scene. Although it would only be in place for a limited period during the construction works it would have a detrimental effect on the Area's appearance during that time. I accept that the scaffolding and associated plastic sheeting which will be necessary throughout the construction period will not improve the area's appearance, particularly if it was inadequately maintained. However, that arrangement would be materially less harmful than a large externally illuminated sign in such a conspicuous position on the building.
8. The advertisement would only occupy a limited area of the two principle elevations of the host building. However, the prominent position of the advertisement would more than offset its size and scale. The use of a shroud that would replicate the façade of the building would reduce the impact of the scaffolding. However, this beneficial effect would only be apparent on the elevations that are less visible from the surrounding street scene. They would not outweigh the harm I have identified arising from the scale, siting and illumination of the advertisement.
9. I therefore conclude that the advertisement would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Moorfields Conservation Area. The Council has cited Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, Policies DM2.1, DM2.3 and DM2.6 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies and its Supplementary Planning Document: *Urban Design Guide* in its decision notice. These, amongst other things, require all development including advertisements, to be high quality and to respond positively to the streetscape and heritage assets, especially in conservation areas. The decision notice also referred to the Moorfields Conservation Area Design Guidelines, which states that the council is opposed to the proliferation of advertisements and the clutter that they cause. I have taken account of the conflict with the requirements of the Council's policies and additional guidance as material considerations in my assessment of the proposal.
10. For these reasons I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR