



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2020

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/20/3244804

The Chequers, 2 High Street, Barkingside, Ilford

- 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 Star Pubs & Bars against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3665/19, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is Sign A: 1x double sided post mounted pictorial, linolites to illuminate, 2x amenity boards fixed to post, , Sign B: 1x set of individual letters and decorative bar, fixed tile effect background, 2x large brass lanterns fixed through fascia, Sign C: 1x set of individual letters, fixed to textured tile effect background, Sign D: 1x amenity board and Sign E: 2x new A0 poster cases.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisements 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The advertisements, the subject of this appeal, were not in place at the time of the application, but the appeal form confirms that they are now in position. Consent is sought for their retention. The plans show former signage at the site and that proposed. The proposal is essentially a refresh of new advertisements in the same site locations. The Council's concerns relate just to three fascia signs, but consent was refused to all advertisements. My comments relate primarily to the three fascia signs.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the signs on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The Chequers Public House is a detached building on the corner of High Street and Tanners Lane. There are Mock-Tudor style gables to both road frontages and another between facing the corner. There is a fascia sign above ground floor windows to both road frontages and a third shorter fascia sign between these, above the entrance and angled to face the road junction. All comprise gold letters fixed to a black background which has a textured tile effect. The letters are centred and slightly smaller than those previously on the building.

5. As the fascias extend to both sides beyond the areas covered by the mounted letters the present advertisements have a greater width than those previously on the building. However, all three fascias are neatly contained within the architectural framing set by the three gables and their black colouring reflects the colour of materials elsewhere on the building. The fascias do not appear unduly large on this corner building or intrusive in the street scene. They are not internally illuminated. In hours of darkness, external lighting is restricted to the letters only so the wider fascias merge into the background of the building.
6. There are parades of shop units next to the site along both High Street and Tanners Lane. Most of these have fascia advertisements of comparable size and height. Many appear to be illuminated which is not unusual in a High Street location. The fascia signs do not result in visual clutter in this context.
7. The other advertisements, the subject of the appeal, are smaller and reflect the colours used on the fascias. The appeal proposal does not detract from the character and appearance of the building or the surrounding area.
8. The Council have drawn my attention to Policies LP26 and LP28 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) in relation to design, advertising and shop fronts. I have taken these into account as material considerations, but powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The proposal is not contrary to the Council's policies which require advertisements to respect the design of the building on which they are erected and the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is not detrimental to the amenity of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined the appeal is allowed. I note that no non-standard conditions have been proposed and I consider that none are necessary.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR