
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/Z/19/3229475

31-33 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1SP

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 ('Regulations') against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Blow Up Media UK Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/0728, dated 18 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is a temporary scaffold shroud screen advertisement for a period of 12 months during scaffolding and works to the building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the temporary scaffold shroud screen advertisement for a period of 12 months during scaffolding and works to the building as applied for. The consent is for a maximum period of 12 months and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The express consent hereby granted shall begin on the first date of the display of the shroud screen advertisement or by not later than 3 months from the date of this decision, whichever is sooner.
 - 2) Written notice shall be given to the Council of the first date of the display of the shroud screen advertisement within 7 days of it being displayed.
 - 3) The advertisement shall be removed at the end of the temporary period of express consent or when external works to the building have been completed, whichever is the earlier.
 - 4) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 300 candelas per square meter.
 - 5) The advertising area shall not exceed 23.4m width x 6.7m height and shall only be displayed at the same time as the 1:1 image of the building.

Procedural Matter

2. Different references have been made to the size of the advertisement display. The submitted plans show a display area of 23.4m width by 6.7m height and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three storey building which is situated on a corner location at the junction of Putney High Street with Putney Bridge Road. The area was busy at the time of my visit and dominated by traffic around this intersection. The location of the appeal site is typical of a town centre, with a variety of retail and commercial uses along ground floor frontages and along with these, a range of advertisements were also visible.
5. The proposed advertisement would be situated covering the first and second floors of the property and be mounted on scaffolding. With dimensions of around 23.4m width by 6.7m height, it would be of a large size. However, given the corner location of the property, it would be set against two frontages on different roads. I also note that the advertisement area would appear alongside a 1:1 coloured image of the building, to either side of the advertisement display area, on each of the two elevations. I do not therefore consider that the shroud screen advertisement would appear as a visually dominant feature in the streetscene.
6. The proposal would be externally illuminated, but in a town centre location, which is well lit from street lighting and which contains various other advertisements in the vicinity of the site that are illuminated, I do not consider the proposed illumination to be unacceptable. The issue of visual clutter has been raised, but given the majority of advertisements in the area around the site are at ground floor fascia level, I do not consider that the proposal, in addition to the one other higher level advertisement referenced nearby, would result in unacceptable visual clutter.
7. Reference has been made to the harm that would arise from the proposal on the setting of nearby heritage assets. My attention has been drawn to the Putney Embankment Conservation Area, a number of locally listed buildings at No's 32-36 Putney High Street and the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church. I have been provided with limited details on these heritage assets, but from the information before me, the proposal would be separated from the Conservation Area, which is on the opposite side of the middle of Putney High Street, with the referenced locally listed buildings also being located further away on the other side of the street. The listed church, from my site observations, is situated close to the River Thames and there are other intervening buildings between it and the appeal site. It's setting, and that of the other heritage assets would therefore be preserved.
8. I have not been presented with any information that shows the income from the advertisement would contribute directly to the repairs of the host building. Despite this, it is clear from the Appellant's submissions that without the income from the advertisement, it is likely that there would not be a 1:1 building image at all, due to the costs involved. Whilst the works proposed to the existing building may only be normal repairs and maintenance, and I note the comments expressed on the duration of the repairs, the works would require scaffolding and typical netting or plastic sheeting which would obscure the building. The proposal would present an attractive alternative to the standardised netting or sheeting and I consider that as a temporary feature, that is typically seen in busy central locations in relation to building works, it would be acceptable considering the amenity of the area.

9. My attention has been drawn to policies from the development plan and reference has been made to the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have taken them into account as material considerations, the power to control advertisements under the regulations may be exercised only in the interests of public safety and amenity. Reference has also been made to a current planning application on the appeal site, but I have been provided with limited details in this respect. Consequently, in my determination of this appeal, these matters have not, themselves, been decisive.
10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. I shall impose the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations. In addition, a number of other conditions have been suggested. The advertisement is sought for a temporary period and the Appellant has suggested that the consent runs from the date of the commencement of the display of the advertisement. Regulation 14(8) of the Regulations enables consent to be granted on whichever is the earlier of (a) the date of commencement of the display and (b) a specified date not later than 6 months after the date on which consent is granted. Given there is some uncertainty about when the display will commence, as this will follow the site set up and erection of scaffold, and to ensure that it is clear when the consent expires, a condition is being imposed to reflect this. I note the comments made that the works could be completed sooner, but I have been provided with a programme which sets out the duration of the works and consider a maximum period of 12 months to be appropriate for the display of the advertisement. A further condition that written notice shall be given to the Council of the date of the display of the shroud screen advertisement is also required. To ensure that the display is only in place during the period of the proposed works to the building, a further condition will require the display to be removed at the end of the temporary period of consent or when the works have been completed, whichever first occurs.
12. The further suggested condition to control the intensity of illumination is necessary in the interests of safety and public amenity and in respect of the latter, a condition controlling the size of the advertisement and it being displayed alongside the 1:1 image of the building is also needed. The wording of some of the suggested conditions have been altered in the interests of conciseness and enforceability.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR