
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/19/3237886

1070 – 1072 Advertising Rights First Floor, Uxbridge Road, Hayes UB4 0RJ

- The appeal is made under section 17 of the Town Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Page of Insite Poster Properties Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 8961/ADV/2019/37 dated 21 June 2019 was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The proposal is an erection of digital advertisement display.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council referred to Policy BE27 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies 27th September 2007 (UDP) and emerging Policy DMHB 13A (incorrectly shown as DMHD 13A) of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies, October 2015 with Main Modifications March 2019, (Local Plan Part 2), within their decision notice. The Council have adopted a new Local Plan since the time of their decision and confirm Policy BE27 of the UDP is withdrawn and policy DMHB 13A is now adopted. The Council have provided copies of the adopted version of DMHB 13A which is identical to the emerging version quoted in the decision notice. I have therefore had regard to this.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an end of terrace property with commercial use on the ground floor and residential accommodation on the upper floors. The remainder of the terrace also shares this configuration. The surrounding area comprises a mix of mostly commercial properties in a variety of architectural styles. The immediate properties to the east of the appeal site are setback from the front

elevation of the appeal property and consist of single storey commercial units. As such, the flank wall of the appeal property is highly visible in long distance views when approaching from the east on Uxbridge Road.

6. As per the planning application and the Officer's report, the proposed advertisement would measure 6m wide and 3m high. It would be sited on the upper section of the appeal property's flank wall facing east, covering a significant proportion of this east elevation. It could be seen during my site visit that most advertisements on the terrace which the appeal site is part of, and the immediate surrounding area, are associated with the ground floor retail and commercial uses and are located at street level. These signs provide a distinctive characteristic to the setting of the appeal site, and no other advertisements of a similar method of illumination, scale or siting can be seen in the same visual context as that proposed. Consequently, the proposed advert would appear incongruous.
7. There is a similar sized advertisement display on the opposite end of the terrace which the appeal property is a part of, facing west. However its context differs from that of the proposed advert in that it has a large open area in front of it and so it is primarily seen as a stand-alone display, with few surrounding adverts with which to contrast.
8. The appellant states the illumination would be to ambient light levels during the day and night and no different to that of surrounding night time advertisement displays or other means of illumination. Nonetheless, even with the limited luminance, the size of the proposed advertisement display would be far greater than those in the immediate vicinity. The lack of any special effects during the transition of the advertisements and energy efficiency gains would not mitigate the negative effect of the advert.
9. Therefore, the proposed advertisement display would result in a large conspicuous and discordant intrusion into the street scene which would dominate long distance views along Uxbridge Road from the east. As such, the proposed advertisement display, even in a predominantly commercial area, would detract from the visual amenity of the appeal site and surrounding area.
10. I have had regard to Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan, Part 1, Strategic Policies, Adopted November 2012, which seeks to protect the character and appearance of the area and Policy DMHB 13A of the adopted version of London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, which seeks to ensure advertisements do not harm the visual amenities of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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