



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor (Non-practising)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/Z/19/3228757

Vacant land on the corner of Station Road, London

- 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 LaSalle Investment Management against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2018/3749/ADV dated 7 November 2018 was refused by notice dated 20 March 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of a totem sign.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The application form did not provide a detailed address for the proposal. In the interests of certainty, the address has therefore been taken from the appeal form, along with the name of the appellant.
4. The Regulations, National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of public safety and amenity. I have therefore taken into account Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM2.1, DM2.6 of the Islington Development Management Policies (2013), Policies 6.10, 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) and the Islington Streetbook Supplementary Planning Document (2012). These policies and guidance documents seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case but are not determinative in reaching a decision on the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed totem sign on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises currently vacant land set back from the northern side of the pavement and adjacent to the junction between the A400 and Station Road, which leads to the Bush Industrial Estate. The surrounding area is characterised by a range of

uses, with a taxi rank and numerous residential buildings of varying styles visible in the immediate vicinity. Various signage is present nearby, particularly at the corner junction between the A400 and Station Road which contains a mixture of road signs and advertisements.

7. The appellant argues that the proposal would be necessary in signposting the location of the Bush Industrial Estate, particularly due to the fact that it has been designated as an Employment Growth Area allocated for intensification of employment uses. However, the proposal involves the erection of an internally illuminated 5 metre high totem sign with branding for Bush Industrial Estate and various tenant logos. Views of the sign would be particularly prominent when travelling along the A400 from the south due to the wide, open nature of the corner junction between the A400 and Station Road. Despite the height of the proposal being reduced during the application process, at 5 m it would still be notably larger than nearby adverts and signs, and the internal illumination would add to its prominence. In this sense it would appear as an unduly dominant and visually jarring feature in the immediate vicinity.
8. From the same viewpoint the proposal would be experienced alongside the numerous road signs and advertisements already present in the corner junction location. This would add an element of additional clutter, detracting from the appearance of the streetscape. This feeling of clutter would be further heightened by the variety of tenant logos that would be displayed on the proposal, in conjunction with the branding for the Bush Industrial Estate.
9. For the reasons given above I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that the design of the proposal is common and has pointed to the illuminated signs at the taxi office as evidence that such adverts are acceptable in the area. However, limited information has been provided in support of this argument, and the rationale for the approval of the illuminated signs at the taxi rank has not been submitted. In any event, due to its corner junction the proposal is situated in a different context and it should be assessed on its own site-specific circumstances.

Conclusion and recommendation

11. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR