



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/20/3245885

Land at junction of Watermead Way and Sedge Road, Haringey, London N17 0UL

- 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 Ben Porte (Clear Channel UK) against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey Council.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/3053, dated 1 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of 1no internally illuminated 48-sheet digital advertisement.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the advertisement on public safety and on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located at the intersection of Watermead Way (A1055) and Sedge Road and lies adjacent to an industrial warehouse. The advert would be sited at an oblique angle to the A1055, predominantly facing highway users heading south, on an overgrown highway verge. An existing 96-sheet advertisement hoarding is located on the opposite corner of the junction.
5. The proposed 6 metre by 3 metre internally illuminated digital advertisement hoarding would be a freestanding structure, comprising a digital display and tapered bottom. The display would show static two-dimensional images on rotation with one advert image every 10 seconds. The advertisements will include no movement, animation, or flashing lights.

Public safety

6. The Council consider that the proposal would be a distracting feature to drivers. Indeed, the Council's Transportation Team raised significant concerns relating

to the impact of the advertisement on highway safety owing to its proposed location at a busy junction with fast moving traffic.

7. Although the appellant alleges that the accident data for the junction of Sedge Road and Watermead Road does not reveal serious concerns and that there would be no conflict with road signage, I am not satisfied that the proposed advertisement would adequately maintain the safety of drivers. On my site visit, I observed that Watermead Road was a busy arterial road and that a significant number of HGVs and large vans use this junction to access the numerous warehouse units on Sedge Road and Garman Road. I recognise Watermead Road is straight and the advert would be visible from a long distance, but the siting of the illuminated advertisement at this busy junction has the potential to distract drivers. Considering there is already a large advertisement on the opposite side of Sedge Road I find the proposed addition of another large advertisement in close proximity, and using a differing form of illumination, would create a disorderly and distracting roadside environment. Although the appellant rejects the fact that four crash incidents in a five year period is concerning, I find it is an indication that highway safety could be improved at this location. The introduction of this large illuminated distracting feature would fail to preserve the safety of the drivers at this junction.
8. Whilst the luminance of the advert can be adequately managed with a suitable condition, the introduction of such a large illuminated advertising panel would nevertheless still constitute a visual intrusion which would cause a hazard to road users.
9. Given the above, I conclude that the proposed development would negatively impact public safety. I have taken into account policy DM3 of the London Borough of Haringey Council Development Management DPD (2017) (the 'local plan') which seeks, among other things, to ensure advertisement proposals contribute to a safe environment and do not cause a hazard to road users. The advert's harmful impact on public safety means it would conflict with this part of the policy.

Visual amenity

10. The surrounding area is utilitarian in character and appearance, as a result of the wide road, the large national grid sub-station on the opposite side of Watermead Way, and the surrounding industrial and warehouse units. When seen within the surrounding context, the proposed advertisement would not appear out of place.
11. In my view, the structure would not be excessively large, obtrusive or prominent. As pointed out by the appellant, it would remain subservient to the large buildings in the vicinity and would somewhat add some colour and interest to what is a stark and unkempt street corner. I note the proposal would add to existing advertisements in the area and that the Council consider this would have a cluttering effect. However, as mentioned above, I find the utilitarian location lends itself well to the display of advertising and that, in this instance, the proposed hoarding would not add visual clutter or have an obtrusive impact.
12. In light of the foregoing, I therefore conclude that in respect of the second main issue, that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area. I have again taken into account policy DM3 which, in part,

seeks to ensure proposals for advertisements are designed to a high standard and are sensitive to their appearance in the surrounding street scene. As I have found that the proposal would not harm amenity it would accord with this part of the policy.

Recommendation

13. I have found that the development would not have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area. This does not however outweigh the harm to highway safety the proposal would cause.
14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. 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