
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/Z/17/3179759
50 - 52 Brushfield Street, London E1 6AG

- 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 Sponsored Restorations Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/17/00754, dated 14 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2017.
 - The proposal is for temporary consent to display a non-illuminated scaffold shroud.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the advert on the amenity of the locality, including the listed buildings and conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this Grade II listed building which is located within the Artillery Passage Conservation Area. There are other listed buildings within the vicinity of the appeal site.
4. The proposal would result in a scaffold shroud placed over the upper floors (1st 2nd and roof) of the Brushfield Street and Crispin Street elevations, containing a 1:1 montage of the building. The Brushfield Street display would also contain an advertisement area of 5.1m in height and 11.5m in length. The appellant states that the revenue from the commercial advertisement would fund the planned renovation works to the building, which have been granted listed building consent. It is also stated that, without the revenue from the commercial advertisement, the restoration works would not go ahead.
5. The proposed advertisement would take up a significant part of the Brushfield Street elevation. Compared to the features of the building itself, the advert would appear large and in my judgement, out of scale with the host building. It would be prominent in views up and down Brushfield Street. I have taken account of the activity and visual disruption to the area that has resulted from the redevelopment of the nearby London Fruit and Wool Exchange, but I find that this does not reduce the effect of the advert on the host building. In relation to wider area, I consider that the proposed advert would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area and

on the setting of nearby listed buildings. This is not negated by the works on the adjacent site, in my judgement. Therefore, I find that the proposed advert would dominate the host building and the street-scene here, to the detriment of the building and area generally.

6. In relation to the works of restoration to the listed building, the positive aspects of these need to be balanced against the harm that I have identified. The appellant is clear that such works will not go ahead without funding from the advert. In order for me to properly judge this matter, I have to take account of the degree of harm arising from the advert which, amongst other things, is determined by its size and length of period for its display. This must also be balanced with the revenue arising from its display which would fund the works. However, I have no detailed information about the likely cost of the restoration works and how this compares to the projected revenue. There is simply insufficient information for me to determine whether the level of harm is justified or whether the revenue would be in excess of the projected costs (and if so, by how much). Therefore, in the absence of such a justification, I conclude that there would be harm to the amenity of the area, taking account of the listed buildings and conservation area and this is not outweighed by other considerations.
7. I have taken account of the appellants other representation, including the comments which indicate that the officer's original recommendation was for approval. However, the information supplied to me includes the officer's report which concludes with a recommendation that consent should be refused. I have used this as the basis for the Council's case. I have also taken account of the stated environmental properties of the shroud, but find these insufficient to outweigh my findings.

Conclusion

8. I find that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the locality and this is not outweighed by other matters. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR