



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 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: 12 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/19/3238510

263 Victoria Road, Wood Green, London N22 7XH

- 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 Punit Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/2019, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is 3 x non illuminated signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two signs positioned at first-floor level.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the sign positioned at ground-floor level and express consent is granted for this 1 non-illuminated sign. 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

3. 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

4. For accuracy, the description of the proposed advertisement set out in the banner heading above has been taken from the decision notice rather than the application form.
5. During my site visit, I observed that there were several advertisements on the appeal site which are not shown within the submitted plans, including a large banner suspended below the first-floor windows of the front elevation, a freestanding sign positioned behind the front boundary wall and window advertisements at ground-floor level. I have considered only the adverts subject of the original planning application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises a two-storey brick building situated on the corner of Victoria Road and Albert Road. The ground floor of the appeal property is in use as a dental practice, with its glazed entrance fronting Albert Road. The appeal property forms one end of the terrace of Nos. 229-263, which mostly comprises residential properties characterised by brick façades, two-storey front bays, turret-style roof features and decorative gable detailing.
8. Two of the proposed signs, due to their height, width and positioning at first-floor level, would be particularly visible along Albert Road from the north and partly from the south. They would also be particularly visible from Rhodes Avenue to the west. Due to their large scale, high-level positioning and close proximity to one another, these two signs would relate poorly to the two-storey bay and decorative gable features of the appeal property. As such, the proposed signs at first-floor level would appear as overly prominent and incongruous additions to the appeal property. They would not blend in with the existing building and although, clearly, much smaller than the building, they would appear excessively sized. As such they would detract from the visual amenity of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
9. The third proposed sign would be situated at ground-floor level and would be attached to a single-storey side element adjacent to the main entrance of the dental practice. Due to its low-level and relatively discreet positioning away from the most prominent parts of the building, this sign would have a less obtrusive impact upon the character of the appeal property. It would also be less visible and prominent in surrounding views. Furthermore, as it would be next to the entrance to the dental practice, this sign would seem appropriate within its immediate context and would not detract from the overall residential character of the surrounding area. As such, the ground-floor advertisement would not cause an unacceptable level of harm to the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the two signs proposed at first-floor level would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area but that the sign proposed at ground-floor level would not be harmful in terms of visual amenity.
11. Insofar as they relate to visual amenity, I have taken into account Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (as amended 2017), which states that the Council seeks to create high-quality, attractive places. I have also taken Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management DPD (2017) into account, which respectively state that the Council supports positive contributions to place and that advertisement proposals must be of a high quality and sensitive to the surrounding street scene. Given that I have concluded that the first-floor level signs of the proposal are harmful to the visual amenity of the area, there is therefore conflict with these policies. However, the ground-floor level sign does not result in harm to the visual amenity of the area and therefore complies with these policies.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed sign at ground-floor level subject to the conditions in the regulations,

but that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the two first-floor adverts.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed in relation to the ground floor non-illuminated sign, but is dismissed in relation to the two first floor non illuminated signs.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR