



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Z/19/3233935

352-354 Camberwell New Road, London SE5 0RW

- 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 Justin Myers of Blow Up Media UK Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 19/AP/1422, dated 13 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is temporary scaffold shroud screen advertisement comprising a 1:1 coloured image of the building façade with an inset advertising and information area measuring 11m wide x 6.7m high for a temporary period of 12 months.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey building that incorporates distinctive gable detailing at third floor level, as well as a turret-style roof feature. Nos. 348 and 350 adjoin immediately to the west and match the detail and proportions of the appeal property, forming a visually cohesive and distinctive terrace. The site is situated on the southwestern corner of the busy commercial junction of Camberwell New Road, Denmark Hill and Camberwell Road, opposite Camberwell Green to the northeast. The site occupies a prominent corner location within the Camberwell Green Conservation Area and is highly visible within long views from the north and east.
 5. The proposed shroud would partially feature a 1:1 coloured image of the appeal property. This element of the proposal would provide a suitable form of screening for the scaffolding needed for forthcoming external refurbishment works. However, the proposed inset area for advertising and information purposes would occupy a substantial proportion of the shroud and would appear as the focus of the shroud due to both its large size and central
-

positioning. Due to the excessive width and height of the inset area at first- and second-floor levels, it is considered that the proposed shroud would have an overtly prominent appearance from the street and would therefore appear as an incongruous addition within the street. As such, the proposed shroud would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the area. Harm caused in this regard is given greater weight due to the appeal site's particularly prominent and visible corner location within the Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area.

6. The appellant asserts that the proposed inset area for advertising would help fund and maintain the 1:1 image of the appeal property on the shroud. However, as the advert would obscure a significant proportion of the building, the benefit of the 1:1 image would be largely lost. Furthermore, the appellant states that the inset area would only be used for advertising for roughly 9 months over the year and would otherwise be infilled with an image of the entire building façade. However, such a restriction would be difficult to enforce. As the proposal relates to a temporary advertisement consent for a period of 12 months, it has been considered on this basis. Though the harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area would only be for this temporary period, it would still be harmful.
7. It is acknowledged that during the time of the forthcoming refurbishment works, the appeal property would have to be hidden behind normal plastic sheet screening. The appellant argues that this screening would in itself have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and that the proposed shroud would provide a better alternative. However, building works and associated scaffolding and sheeting are not an uncommon sight and would only have a neutral impact on the street scene and the Conservation Area.
8. I understand that the proposed lighting of the inset area could be controlled or omitted altogether by condition. I consider that, even without the lighting, the advert would be unacceptably prominent and so the proposed lighting would only further highlight the prominence of the inset area and would increase the harmful effect that the proposal would have upon the visual amenity of the area.
9. The appellant opines that most Councils would approve the proposal as it would provide a planning gain and public benefits compared to normal screening. However, as no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this would be the case, this is considered to be speculation.
10. I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to consider whether the proposed advertisement would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area. Conservation of designated heritage assets is also given special emphasis in the National Planning Policy Framework. Having identified that the advertisement would harm the visual amenity of the area, I find that it would also thereby fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. Insofar as they relate to visual amenity, I have taken into account the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which states that the quality of places can suffer when advertisements

are poorly design. I have also taken into account Saved Policies 3.12, 3.15, 3.16 and 3.18 of the Southwark Plan (2007), which broadly require high-quality design and the conservation of the historic environment and conservation areas. I have also taken Policy 3.23 of the Southwark Plan (2007) into account, which states that outdoor advertisements on shroud hoardings should not harm amenity. I have also taken Strategic Policy 12 of the Core Strategy (2011) into account, which further states that the highest possible standards of design are required to create attractive and distinctive places. Given that I have concluded that the proposal is harmful to visual amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Other Matters

12. The appellant cites a passage from the determination of a recent appeal in Westminster. The appellant also provides a photograph of a shroud over a listed building in a conservation area in Kensington and Chelsea. However, as the details of those cases are not before me to consider, I cannot conclude as to whether those cases are comparable to this appeal. In any case, each appeal must be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

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 appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR