
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2020

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/Z/19/3238803

Railway Bridge wall, adjacent 270 Hoe Street, Walthamstow E17 9QD

- 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 Ms Anna McAree of Build Hollywood Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 191756, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 August 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is a wall-mounted non-illuminated poster display board for the display of 4-sheet posters.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I could see from my site visit that the proposal has been erected in accordance with the submitted plans. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is on the western side of the railway bridge between the Travelodge hotel to the south and the 'Quickstop' newsagent kiosk to the north on the corner of Selborne Road. The railway bridge is part of Network Rail property associated with Walthamstow station, which is beneath the bridge. The site is part of Walthamstow Town Centre. A deep pedestrian pavement extends over the railway bridge. This has been recently landscaped and includes planting and a bus stop opposite the appeal site. As a result of the Town Centre location along with the bus and railway stations, there is a high pedestrian footfall.
5. While the advert maybe regularly maintained and the displays routinely changed, the size of the proposal dominates the railway bridge when viewed from either direction and from the pavement in front of it. The proposal is not, despite the plethora of advertisements found in the surrounding area and the absence of illumination, an incidental feature to what is largely a commercial area. I accept that the proposal sits within the confines of the railway bridge wall, but only just. As such, the proposal does not blend with the scale of the

host wall as the appellant suggests. I do, however, agree with the appellant that the proposal does not cause clutter. Nevertheless, the scale of the proposal is not in my view an expected part of the commercial environment. So much so that it is harmful to the visual amenity of the area.

6. The Council have cited Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM29 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan. These seek development by reason of their location and size to not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the surrounding area so that adverts respond positively to the local context and character. Thus, they are material in the consideration in this case. I have also had regard to paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework which explains that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
7. I agree that the proposal does not affect residential amenity or public safety, and while the company operating the site may specialise in community based advertisements, these matters do not alter or outweigh my conclusion that the advert is not acceptable, insofar as the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with the policies set out above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR