
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSC PIEMA RTPI (Assoc)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/Z/19/3227808

Os 87 - 91 Lodos Food Centre, Old Street, London, EC1V 9JJ

- 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 Nathan Still on behalf of Infocus Public Networks Ltd against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/0260/ADV, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is described on the application form as: *the display of a single illuminated sequential display affixed to the frame of the communication hub.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Amenity is not defined within the Regulations nonetheless relevant factors include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. In assessing amenity, it is reasonable to consider characteristics of the neighbourhood. For example, whether the proposed hoarding would be in scale and keeping with important features. There are no free-standing illuminated advertisements or illuminated phone booth advertisements located on the pavement on this section of Old Street. Illuminated advertisements are not a feature of the area.
5. The appeal site is located on the pavement outside no. 87-91 Old Street, close to the junction with Central Street. The surrounding area is of mixed character with properties immediately surrounding the site being at varied height and used for commercial purposes, mostly at ground floor level. While the proposed advertisement would be controlled, it would be of the same size as the existing advertisement on the payphone kiosk.
6. The argument is that the addition of illumination to an advertisement that is integral to the kiosk would not cause harm. However, the addition of

illumination at that size would result in a visually prominent display within the street scene. In this location, the single illuminated sequential display would be a discordant and unduly prominent feature, because of its scale. The type and design of the advertisement would detract from the street's quality along this section of Old Street, and it would be visually harmful to the locality.

7. There are examples of advertisements on the pavement, but these are not illuminated. They are not directly comparable to the proposal and are not good reason to allow visually harmful advertisement.
8. The Regulations seek to control advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has drawn attention to policies as material considerations. These have not been decisive, but the proposal would be at odds with the objectives of policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011), DM2.1 and DM2.6 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013) and 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on visual amenity of the area. I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR