
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/19/3242961
1-3 Kingsley Road, Hounslow TW3 1PA

- 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 Liyaqath Hussain (ChalknDuster Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00667/1-3(U5)/AD1, dated 12 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of three signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the amenity of the area, with particular regard to the appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Regulations¹ and the National Planning Policy Framework state that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. Factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest².
4. The appeal concerns three proposed non-illuminated advertisements, two of which are proposed to be positioned on the appeal building (Signs 1 and 2) and a further on a freestanding pole adjacent to the highway (Sign 3). At the time of my visit, Signs 2 and 3 were in situ.
5. The appeal building is located within a busy street, opposite the junction of Kingsley Road and Cecil Road, it is therefore visually prominent. However, due to the varied nature of the commercial premises present in the locality, the design of shopfronts and advertisements varies significantly.
6. At the time of my site visit I observed that the other advertisements at first floor, shown on the photographs of the appeal building provided by the appellant, were no longer in place. In addition, I note that many of the fascia signs shown in those photographs have also altered.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

² Regulation 3(2) of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

7. Although I am not aware of the circumstances that led to the removal or alteration of these advertisements, but I appreciate that the area appears to be more likely to be receptive to such changes. However, it is not implicit that all modifications to the local environment will be appropriate or, for that matter, that all its constituent parts should inevitably be suitable for accommodating some form of advertisement.
8. In the case of proposed Sign 1, it would be positioned between the fascia sign and the eaves line at the northernmost end of the appeal building (Unit 5). The eaves of Unit 5 are lower than the remainder of the appeal building and positioned just above the first-floor window. Given its length and height, the proposed advertisement would occupy a sizeable part of the front façade of this part of the appeal building. It would therefore appear as a dominant and obtrusive addition to the building that would contrast significantly with the simple fascia sign below. Furthermore, as advertisements situated above fascia signs in Kingsley Road are not a feature of its appearance, Sign 1 would also contrast with the wider approach to advertisements in the street.
9. Proposed Sign 2 will also be positioned at a higher level, above first floor, and its shape would mirror the raised parapet situated to the southern gable end of the building. I note that there was previously an advertisement displayed in this position in connection with the use of the whole appeal building as a public house, 'The Duke of Cambridge'. However, as I understand it, the ground floor of the building is divided into separate units and the first floor occupied by flats. In terms of Sign 3, it will be positioned to either side of a freestanding pole mounted sign, at the southwestern corner of the site. There also previously appears to have been a sign located here in connection with the public house.
10. Whilst Signs 2 and 3 will identify the presence of the appellant's business in a part of the appeal building and refer to the nature of the business carried out, they do not relate to an active part of the frontage of the building occupied by the business. Proposed Signs 2 and 3 will therefore constitute unnecessary proliferation of advertisements, which will have an adverse visual effect on a part of the building not in use by the appellant and lead to additional visual clutter within Kingsley Road.
11. For the above reasons, given their size and location, the proposed advertisements would/will appear visually harmful and add clutter to the detriment of the appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore conclude that the proposal would/will harm the visual amenity of the area.
12. I have taken into account the provisions of Policies CC1 and CC5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030; and paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, so far as they are material, in accordance with the Regulations³. Together these policies require that proposals demonstrate that the advertisement and associated structure are of a size, design, scale and degree of illumination that is compatible with the surrounding buildings, other advertising and the wider area; will not result in visual clutter or a proliferation of harmful advertising; and should be integral to the building's design, working with the elevation and any architectural features, and relevant to the use and context.

³ Regulation 3(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

Conclusion

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

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR