
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2019

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K5030/H/18/3211267

Cheapside (roughly opposite entrance to St Paul's Underground Station), London, EC2V 6AA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by British Telecommunications plc against the decision of the City of London Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00537/ADVT, dated 18 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2018.
 - The advertisements proposed are internally illuminated digital LED screen to both sides of the proposed free standing InLink.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for internally illuminated digital LED screen to both sides of the proposed free standing InLink 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.

Procedural Matter

2. When originally lodged, the appeal was also accompanied by an appeal relating to a Prior Approval proposal for an Inlink kiosk. However, following the Westminster CC v SSHCLG & New World Payphones Ltd [2019] EWHC 176 (Admin) judgement, that appeal has been withdrawn.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on a wide traffic island situated between Cheapside and St Martin's Le Grand, opposite the entrance to St Pauls' Underground Station at Panyer Alley in a largely commercial setting surrounded by contemporary buildings. The island has a relatively uncluttered appearance with large attractively planted raised beds on two corners.
5. The proposal would replace three existing BT kiosks which are sited adjacent to one another, with a single free-standing structure with integrated digital advertising displays on either side. Although its location would be prominent, it would result in the reduction of street furniture at this site and would therefore preserve the existing character of this area. The proposed illuminated

advertisements by their nature seek to attract attention however, I find that they would be in keeping with the character of this busy area, which already includes illuminated signage on commercial premises in close proximity to the appeal site. Consequently, I find that the positioning of two advertising screens in this location would preserve the functional urban characteristics of the appeal site.

6. I have carefully considered the Council's concerns in respect of the proposal intruding into views of the dome of the listed St Paul's Cathedral and the tower of the listed Christchurch Greyfriars. However, the proposal needs to be considered within the city centre context that provides the setting for the listed buildings which typically contains various other forms of street furniture. Given the significant and imposing scale of St Paul's Cathedral and Christchurch Greyfriars, such items of street furniture do not detract from their significance or setting. Further, given their distance from the appeal site and the presence of intervening contemporary buildings, I find that the proposal would not have any material impact on their setting.
7. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material and find that the proposal accords with the overall design and heritage protection aims of policies CS10, CS12, DM12.1 and DM10.6 of the City of London Local Plan Adopted 15 January 2015 and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016. There is also no conflict with the design or heritage protection policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR