
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2020

by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/Z/19/3235649

113 Stoke Newington High Street, Hackney, London N16 0PH

- 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 Jeff Parsons against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2019/1987, dated 29 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is a fascia board with internally lit lettering.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the fascia board with internally lit lettering as applied for. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional condition:
 - 1) The proposed illuminated signage should operate at an illumination level no greater than 600cd/m² between dusk and dawn.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the advertisement on amenity, having particular regard to whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Stoke Newington Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The conservation area covers much of the centre of Stoke Newington, and this is reflected in its character and appearance as it has a preponderance of offices, restaurants, take-aways, retail units and similar with their associated advertisements. Its significance lies, in part, in the way the buildings and spaces it covers reflect the historic evolution of this centre. In this regard the row containing No 113 makes a positive contribution to this significance, as it is in a lengthy Victorian terrace with each property having retail uses at ground floor in a single storey element that projects out to the back of the pavement. It therefore represents a notable phase in the evolution and development of the commercial heart of Stoke Newington.
4. All the retail units in the terrace have advertisements at fascia level, and these show a great range of styles, forms, materials and illumination methods. However, they nonetheless provide some uniformity as many are roughly a similar height above the pavement and have broadly comparable depths.

5. This appeal concerns an advertisement that is now being displayed. To my mind it accords with the position and general dimensions of fascia advertisements along the terrace, and so its size is not inappropriate. Moreover, it has projecting internally illuminated lettering that takes up a sizeable amount of its area but that form of signage is found elsewhere on the terrace, and to my mind does not result in an unduly striking arrangement. Whilst there is no border, that again is not unique and in any event strips of masonry separate the advertisement from the fascia signage to either side, ensuring the grain of the property is respected and an excessive length of advertisements is avoided. Finally, concern was also raised about the main body of the advertisement not being of a matt material but being more reflective. That though is not a view I share, considering it is sufficiently subdued to mean it is not discordant.
6. However, in order to avoid the advertisement from being unacceptably bright and dominant at night time, I consider a condition should be imposed restricting its level of illumination between dusk and dawn.
7. Overall, I therefore conclude that the advertisement subject of this appeal suitably respects the advertisements on this terrace, and does not fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area or harm its significance. Furthermore, it also does not detract from the streetscape or the host property. As such, it does not conflict with the advice in the *National Planning Policy Framework* or, insofar as they are a material consideration to this advertisement appeal, Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 in *The London Plan*, Policies CS24 and CS25 in the *Core Strategy*, Policies DM1, DM28 and DM29 in the *Development Management Local Plan* and the *Public Realm Supplementary Planning Document* which all broadly seek to preserve and enhance the historic built environment and safeguard the character and appearance of the area from inappropriate change.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR