



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/Z/19/3232371

194 Kingsland Road, London E2 8AN

- 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 Build Hollywood Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2017/2341, dated 7 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is two non-illuminated advertising panels: 1 panel measuring 3300mm H x 6350 W, 2nd panel measuring 1740mm H x 4200mm W.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the signs on the visual amenity of the area

Reasons

3. The proposed advertising panels have already been provided on site. I understand that they replaced signs of a similar size.
4. The appeal property is situated on the corner of Kingsland Road and Whiston Road, with the signs facing onto Whiston Road. The site falls within the Kingsland Conservation Area which is centred on Kingsland Road. It is characterised by a mix of buildings of varied heights which incorporate ground floor commercial uses and it features a number of prominent buildings, including the Geffrye Museum and The Library.
5. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
6. The appeal building comprises a retail unit on the ground floor fronting Kingsland Road with residential accommodation on the upper floors of the building. The elevation onto Whiston Road has a cluttered appearance and contains a number of windows of different sizes, external extract ducts, meter boxes and two doors, one with a roller shutter. The advertising panels fill the remaining area of blank wall on this elevation and add further to the cluttered appearance of the building.

7. I can see from the evidence before me that the 48 sheet poster panel replaced a sign of a similar size and it has been put to that this benefited from deemed consent. Nevertheless, even if the advert has deemed consent, this does mean that express consent for a harmful display should follow.
8. I have viewed the signs walking along Kingsland Road, and viewed other similar panels displayed in the vicinity of the site, however I am not aware whether these are authorised and in any event, their existence does not justify further harm.
9. The advertisement panels are incongruous, over-dominant, unduly prominent and visually intrusive in the street scene. I consider that the size and number of signs lead to a proliferation of advertisements which cause harm to the visual appearance of the area and fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area. Consequently, I conclude that the advertisements have a harmful effect on amenity and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area.
10. Whilst not determinative, I have taken into account policies CS24 and CS25 of the Hackney Core Strategy 2010 and policy DM29 of the Hackney Development Management Local Plan 2015 and policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the adverts are in conflict with these policies.
11. For the reasons given above I dismiss the appeal.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR