
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/Z/20/3260909

Site at Station Road, London Easting (x) 529209 Northing (y) 186063

- 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 LaSalle Investment Management against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/1672/ADV, dated 24 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is directional estate signage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for directional estate signage. 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 description of the proposal has been altered on the Council decision notice. The original description however adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council has drawn my attention to Local Plan Policy it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken it into account as a material consideration. I have therefore taken into account Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM2.1 and DM2.6 of the Islington Development Management Policies (2013) and Policies D1, D8 and T2 of the London Plan (2021) which was adopted during the course of the appeal. I have also taken into account the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) and the Islington Streetbook Supplementary Planning Document (2012).
4. However, powers under the regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal the policies and guidance have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The advertisement would be 2.5m in height and placed in a recessed area set back from the footway to the north of Station Road, closely to the east of its junction with the A400. The advertisement would provide directional signage to the nearby Bush Industrial Estate and would be externally illuminated.
7. The signage itself would be of smart and modern appearance and although the top of the advertisement would be slightly higher than the adjacent fence it would not be of excessive height. There is a degree of visual clutter on the corner, including traffic signage, lighting columns and other advertisements. However, the signage is simple and would be set back from the footway within a rational position. Within this context it would not form additional clutter or be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The static external illumination would be compatible with the urban character of the area and the nearby street signage is also externally illuminated.
8. Subject to the five standard conditions set out in the regulations, I am satisfied that the advertisement would cause no harm to the visual amenity of the area and would be acceptable in terms of public safety. It would therefore accord with the amenity and public safety aims of Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM2.1 and DM2.6 of the Islington Development Management Policies (2013) and Policies D1, D8 and T2 of the London Plan (2021). The same would be the case for the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) and the Islington Streetbook Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Other Matters

9. Whilst every appeal is determined on its own merits, I have had regard to a previous appeal at the site which was dismissed relating to the installation of a totem sign Ref: APP/V5570/Z/19/3228757. However, material changes have been made to the advertising scheme including a significant reduction in advertisement height and the omission of tenant logos. I therefore consider that these changes have overcome the concerns identified by the previous Inspector.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, the appeal should be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR