
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/19/3235316

Swan Wharf Business Centre, Unit 3, Waterloo Road, Uxbridge, UB8 2RA

- 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 Louis Erasmus (Crew Contractors) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74731/ADV/2019/15, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is 3no. fascia signs and 1no. free-standing sign.
-

Decision

1. That part of the appeal that relates to the 1no. free-standing sign is dismissed. That part of the appeal that relates to the 3no. fascia signs at Swan Wharf Business Centre, Unit 3, Waterloo Road, Uxbridge, UB8 2RA is allowed and express consent is granted for their display, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 74731/ADV/2019/15, dated 3 April 2019. 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.

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 copy of the Council's Decision Notice submitted with the appeal documents is not dated. I have taken the date of the notice in the banner header above from the appellant's appeal questionnaire.¹

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Two of the fascia advertisements have been erected. They are located either side of the centrally positioned first floor window on the south elevation of the appeal unit. They measure 1450mm high by 2150mm wide, measurements

¹ Section C – Date of LPA's decision.

taken from the drawings which are not disputed. They feature yellow and white text on a black background. The application form indicates that they are to be externally illuminated by means of static illumination. These advertisements appear to be similar in size to those at Unit 3 to the west of the appeal unit and the fascia advertisement on the Waterloo Road elevation of Unit 1 to the east. Given the appeal site's location on a commercial estate, and its relationship to nearby units and advertisement material, the new fascia signs on this elevation of the building do not harm the character and appearance of the appeal building, the adjacent units or surrounding area.

6. The application form describes a third fascia sign. This advertisement would comprise three vinyl yellow chevrons to the roller shutter door on the south elevation of the appeal unit. Given the functional appearance of the appeal unit, and the context within which it is viewed, this advertisement would not result in harm to the visual amenities of the area.
7. In light of my findings I conclude that the 3no. fascia signs are in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and do not result in harm to its visual amenity. Accordingly, there is no conflict with the aims of Saved Policies BE27 and BE29 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies 27th September 2007 (UDP) and emerging Policy DMHB13A of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications March 2019 (LP) which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. The Council also refer to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies². However, this policy refers to new development and so is not directly relevant to this appeal proposal.
8. The free-standing sign would be located on land at the south east corner of the appeal site, close to the junction of Waterloo Road and Cowley Mill Road. It would consist of two signs arranged in a 'V' shape. The proposed drawings and application form indicate that this would measure 1740mm wide by 1180mm high with the base 1400mm above the ground. The advertisement would feature white and yellow text on a black background and would be constructed from vinyl on a metal frame. It would not be illuminated.
9. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. In this case, whilst there are a number of signs and advertisements close to the proposed siting of the free-standing sign, it would, as a result of its size and prominent location appear as an incongruous and overly dominant feature within the street scene. Moreover, it would result in visual clutter when taken with nearby street furniture and signage including traffic lights, road signs, tall street lighting columns and telecommunication cabinets.
10. In reaching this view I have considered the existing advertisements in the vicinity of the appeal site, including those referred to by the appellant, and the advertisements at Unit 1 of the commercial estate, which the appellant advises have been approved by the Council. However, the freestanding appeal sign is of a different design and scale to these other advertisements, as well as being located at a prominent junction and so is not directly comparable. Therefore, I

² A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part1 Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012)

afford this matter limited weight and do not consider that their presence outweighs the harm that I have identified.

11. Consequently, I conclude that the free-standing sign would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area. There would be conflict with the aims of Saved Policies BE27 and BE29 of the UDP and emerging Policy DMHB13A of the LP which seek to protect amenity and prevent visual clutter, so are material in this case.

Conditions

12. The Council has indicated that other than the five standard conditions set out in schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, no further conditions are necessary. I concur.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, I recommend that a split decision is issued and that the free-standing sign is dismissed, and the fascia signs are allowed with the five standard conditions.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the part of the appeal that relates to the free-standing sign is dismissed. That part of the appeal that relates to the fascia signs as applied for is allowed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR