



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/20/3250755

Beefeater Gin Distillery, 20 Montford Place, London SE11 5DE

- 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 Beefeater Gin Distillery, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 20/00173/ADV, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2020.
- The advertisement is for an artwork sign for Beefeater Gin.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of an artwork sign for Beefeater Gin as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration where relevant. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interest of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) reiterates this approach. In my determination of this appeal the Council's policies have not therefore, in themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area, the Conservation Area in which it sits and the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The original part of the appeal building is locally listed and is constructed in traditional red brick. It has a number of pleasant architectural features including a prominent tower. The property has had a number of additions and modifications including a large rear element which is clad in silver coloured panelling. The proposal would sit upon the north facing flank wall of this addition.
6. The area immediately surrounding the appeal site is a mix of large gas holders, compounds and hoardings, with traditional residential terrace blocks located adjacent to the east, and south boundaries and beyond to the north. Very few adverts are visible around the immediate area other than those located on the nearby hoardings and on a nearby public house.
7. The appeal site is located along the south western boundary of the Kennington Conservation Area (KCA), with its significance as far as it relates to this appeal, deriving from the street layouts, surrounding terraced properties with their architectural detailing, along with the longstanding visual links and prominence of the nearby large gas holder.
8. Surrounding the site are a number of heritage assets located in Kennington Lane, the Imperial Court, Kennington Road and Mountford Place. Whilst visibility of the appeal site is not possible from all of these heritage assets, the 'setting' of a heritage asset is defined in the glossary to the Framework as 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced'. Setting, therefore, can extend to more than just a visual connection, it can also include associative or historical links.
9. The proposal as a result of its design and scale would cover the majority of the exposed flank wall and as such would appear as a large and visually prominent feature within the surrounding area. Nevertheless, just because it is large and visually prominent does not necessarily mean that this equates to harm. Its siting and visually striking appearance is reminiscent of traditional advertisements typically located on prominent end gable and flank walls of commercial properties. Whilst I appreciate that advertisements of this type are not characteristic of the area, neither is the appeal building itself in terms of its oversized industrial looking additions along with its commercial use. Nevertheless, the proposed large vinyl montage of images would appear proportionate to its overall scale and size of the original building and would have a clear association with the building's use. Moreover, as a result of its design and colour palette, it would complement the colouring and fabric of the traditional front façade of the appeal building, unlike the existing silver panelling which jars against it and appears visually juxtaposed.
10. Despite its visual prominence it would not detract from the interesting architectural features of the host property nor would it detract from the characteristics of the KCA in so far as they relate to the appeal site. Views from within the KCA would be limited to the streets that directly overlook the appeal site and these would also take in the more prominent and industrial backdrop of the appeal building itself and the nearby gas holders. Given this, I find that it would not appear as visually harmful to the amenity or to the character and

appearance of the KCA. The character and appearance of the KCA would therefore be preserved.

11. Similarly, whilst it would be visible from a number of the surrounding heritage assets, it would not impact or affect important views to and from these, particularly as a result of the separation distances and the surrounding context in which these views would be taken. The proposal's effect on the setting of the designated heritage assets would therefore be neutral and the experience of these assets within their setting would be sustained.
12. Having regard to the above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the visual amenity of the area, the Conservation Area in which it sits and the setting of the nearby listed buildings. As such, I am satisfied that there is no conflict with Policies Q17, Q20, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015), Advertising & Signage Guidance 2016, the Kennington Conservation Area Statement 2012, the objectives of which include the conservation of heritage assets and a requirement that the design of new development responds positively to local distinctiveness and character. These policies are consistent with paragraph 132 of the Framework which seeks to avoid poorly sited and designed advertisements

Conclusion and Conditions

13. The Council have suggested conditions that reduce the period of consent from 5 years to 1 year. However, they have not provided any substantive reasons for this and having regard to the above findings I consider it is not necessary. I have attached the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.
14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of the sign.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, the appeal should be allowed.

C Preston

INSPECTOR