



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/19/3226105
178-182 High Street, Ruislip HA4 8LJ

- 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 Peter McAndrew (Manor Developments) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 28388/ADV/2019/4, dated 23 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 non-illuminated sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1 non-illuminated sign 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 Matters

2. The proposed sign is already in place so I have considered it on that basis.
3. The sign was described differently and imprecisely on the application form, decision notice and appeal forms. Agreement was sought from the main parties to change the description to that which I have used in the banner heading and my decision to more accurately describe the advertisement applied for.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA) on the end of a terraced row of retail and commercial premises at the four-way junction of High Street with Kingsend. It has a mixed use of retail and residential with a shop front facing the High Street. The rear backs onto Princess Lane, which services the rear of the High Street properties and Kingsend North Car Park.
6. The CA Appraisal describes the High Street as the retail and commercial core of the CA, comprising parades of early 20th century shops influenced by the 'Arts and Crafts' cottage tradition, but with some more modern purpose-built buildings at the southern end, like the three-storey appeal property. It recognises the variety in styles of shopfronts and signage on the High Street,

as well as the air extraction units, flues, fire escapes and parking to the rear of the High Street.

7. The sign has been placed on the rear of the building above the ground floor windows. It is visible for a short extent on Kingsend, but mainly in the less sensitive semi-residential context of Princess Lane, which is characterised by the rear of the High Street and car park, as well as residential development to the west. Although this sign is larger than any of the windows in the rear elevation, it does not appear significantly out of proportion in relation to the large three storey elevation it sits within. It is also neatly aligned with the windows and is therefore respectful of the general order of fenestration and architectural composition of the building. I can see from the submitted photographs that the sign it has replaced was of a very similar size and position. In this respect there has been no significant change.
8. There has been a change to the colour and materials, which are now predominantly white with dark red and grey characters. It also stands proud of the elevation. However, the Wimpy sign on the rear of the adjoining property also stands proud from the elevation and both are seen in the same context. Whilst the Wimpy sign is a darker colour, I do not agree that the colour of the appeal sign is dramatic and intrusive. I saw many signs of a similar type, materials and colour in the area and I consider the appeal sign to be quite neutral in appearance.
9. Issues raised over the need for the sign, its specific content and whether it is misleading are not factors which I can take into account when assessing the effect on amenity under the Advertisement Regulations. Furthermore, there have been suggestions made on alternative materials, colour and size for the sign but these are not justified given my findings above, and in any event, I can only consider the appeal proposal before me.
10. For all these reasons, I am satisfied that the scale, design and positioning of the advertisement is not visually intrusive on the building or in the street scene. Accordingly, it has not caused any harm to the amenity of the area and the character and appearance of the Ruislip Conservation Area has been preserved.
11. Consequently, the proposal accords with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE27 and BE29 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Shopfronts. These policies and guidance seek to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, ensure advertisements do not materially harm the visual amenity of an area and preserve or enhance features which contribute to conservation areas.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR