The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2018

by G. Rollings, BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/H/18/3200197
Rockys, 81 Norwood Road, Southall, UB2 4DZ

- 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 Mrs Natalie Gaunt (New Wave Installations Cardtronics UK Ltd.) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref: 17/8473/ADV dated 23 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2018.
- The advertisement is a P77 ATM Pod, black and green non illuminated decal signage with white lettering "cashzone" and "cash withdrawals and free balance enquiries" applied to the ATM Pod elevations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The advertisements that are the subject of this appeal have been installed. Having inspected the site, I am satisfied that the appeal plans and other documentation are an accurate representation of what has been erected.

3. The appellant's description of the advertisements included information pertaining to the built structure on which they are installed. In the description of the development at the top of this letter, I have included only that part of the appellant's description relating to the advertisement, and have omitted any references to the built structure, which is the subject of a separate appeal that I have considered concurrently.[1]

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the visual impact of the advertisement on the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises an end-of-terrace, two-storey building, with a ground floor commercial property adjoined by an open forecourt, located on the corner or Norwood Road and Victoria Road. The advertisements are affixed to a free-standing kiosk housing an automated teller machine (ATM), which adjoins the property boundary with the residential property at 83 Norwood Road.

[1] Appeal ref: APP/A5270/Z/18/3200193.

6. The terrace incorporates a row of residences and the appeal site commercial use, and is set back from the road. Each of the properties have a forecourt, with most used as driveways, separated by low fences or vegetation. The kiosk is set approximately midway along the short boundary with No. 83 and the exposed location of the advertisements enable them to be clearly seen across the neighbouring forecourts, and from both Norwood Road approaches.

7. The advertisements cover a large proportion of the kiosk. In views close to the property, they appear against the background of the appeal site commercial property, which also has advertisement signs affixed to its frontage, as does an additional commercial property on the adjacent street corner. Despite the fact that they are predominantly black in colour and not illuminated, they are nonetheless clearly noticeable within the street scene.

8. I have taken into account the appellant's comments that the appeal advertisements do not have a greater impact than those on the shop frontages and would be consistent with existing signage. I do not consider this to be the case, due to the freestanding location of the appeal advertisements, which project closer to the road and a much more visible in the street scene than those affixed to the properties. This visibility causes them to appear both obtrusive and incongruous within the otherwise neat layout of the immediate area, drawing attention in views, and creating visual clutter around the street intersection. They are also inappropriate in their location directly adjoining a residential property, where they are visible from its forecourt and entrance. As such, the advertisements have a negative effect on the area's visual amenity.

9. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies set out in the development plan for the area; namely its *Development Management Development Plan Document* (2013) Policies 7.4 and 7B, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of *The London Plan* (2016), which it considers to be relevant to this appeal. I have taken them into account as a material consideration, and consider that the proposal would conflict with these policies, for the reasons set out above. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and/or public safety. Consequently, these policies have not been a decisive consideration in reaching my decision.

10. I therefore conclude, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR