

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021 by Max Webb

**Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 1 December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/Z/21/3276788**

**21–27 Lidl UK GmbH, The Concourse, Edmonton N9 0TY**

- 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 Lidl GB Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref 21/00642/ADV, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2021.
  - The advertisement proposed is 2 no. internally illuminated, wall mounted, fascia-mounted signs.
- 

## 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.

## Procedural Matters

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a large building, occupied by a shop at ground floor level and a large sign above this on a reasonably blank section of wall. The existing sign is related to the area in general and provides an important and identifiable feature in the street scene. Advertising related to specific shops is not common in the area above ground floor level.
6. The proposal seeks to install two illuminated signs on either side of the existing sign. These signs would be large and, although not an inappropriate scale for

the building itself, would add visual clutter in close proximity to the existing sign. The symmetry of the proposed signs would not change the fact their proximity to the existing signage would disrupt this important feature of the street scene which on its own provides a clear indicator of the shopping centre. As there is little specific advertising above ground floor level in the vicinity of the appeal site, the proposal would appear prominent and out of place and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

7. Consent has been granted for other illuminated signage in the vicinity of the appeal site, including at 13, 19 and 29-31 The Concourse, and there are various illuminated signs in the area, including on the existing shopfront on the appeal building. These examples contribute to the commercial character at ground floor level of the area, whereas the appeal proposal would add clutter at higher level that would disrupt the street scene, regardless of its level of illumination.
8. Overall, the proposal would harm the visual amenity of the area. Regard has been given to Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (adopted 2010) which aims to ensure interventions within the public realm are design-led and have regard for their context. Consideration has also been given to Policies DMD37 and DMD41 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014) which together seek to ensure advertisements have appropriate regard for their surroundings, as well as being a suitable size with relation to the street scene. Regard has likewise been given to Policy D8 of the London Plan (2021), which aims to ensure the attractiveness of the public realm. Given that I have concluded the proposal would harm visual amenity, it would conflict with these Policies.
9. Policy D1 of the London Plan is referred to only in the Council's officer report, and Policy D4 is referred to in both the officer report and the decision notice. Policy D1 is strategic in nature and Policy D4 relates to the procedural aspects of planning decisions. Neither of these Policies are therefore particularly relevant to this appeal.

### **Other Matters**

10. As the proposal would be a substantial distance from the nearby listed building, and only seen from a small part of the Fore Street Conservation Area, it is not considered the proposal would have a significant impact on these heritage assets.
11. The desire to increase the store's visibility and the potential benefits of this to the community and town centre have been considered. However, as there is substantial existing signage for the store and the proposal relates to a single shop, it is not considered these potential benefits would outweigh the harm to the visual amenity of the area.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Max Webb*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

**Inspector's Decision**

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR