

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by Hollie Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/Z/21/3287544

99 Summerstown, London SW17 0BQ

- 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 Guy Goodyear (Emerald Outdoor Limited) against London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/3798, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated, 21 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing 48 sheet advertising billboard with a digital 48 sheet billboard.
-

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 Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site relates to the side elevation of a commercial building located on Summerstown (the B235) close to a mini roundabout leading to Plough Lane and Wimbledon Road. The area is characterised by a mix of residential and commercial uses. The proposed advert would face directly onto a car park used by customers of 'Jordans Wood Floor Warehouse' and be visible to vehicle traffic travelling north along Summerstown. The appeal site is in close proximity to, and visible from, the rear of a number of terraced residential properties located on Wimbledon Road and residential flats in Farloe House, located on the opposite side of Summerstown.
5. The proposed 48 sheet digital display would replace an existing advertisement. The appellant has drawn my attention to the long history of advertisements in this location and that the proposed advert would have the same proportions and orientation as existing. However, the existing poster advertisement is relatively understated and this would be particularly the case during hours of darkness. By contrast, the proposed advertisement's internal illumination and the sequential images displayed would give it a more dominant presence that would contribute to the area appearing visually cluttered and of a poorer quality.

6. Whilst I note that the level of illumination proposed is within the maximum standards as set out by the Institute of Lighting Professionals, the appeal site's close proximity to the residential dwellings on Wimbledon Road and Summerstown means that the internally illuminated advertisement would be an imposing feature for the occupiers of these dwellings. This would be particularly the case from the windows and balconies serving the apartments on the ground and first floor in Farloe House and the first floor windows of the closest residential properties on Wimbledon Road. Consequently, the proposed digital advertisement would be an incompatible feature, harmful to the visual amenity of the area, particularly for the nearest residential occupants.
7. The appellant has suggested that the times of operation could be controlled by condition. However, restrictions to the times of operation would not overcome the harm identified above.
8. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account Policy DMS1 and Policy DMS8 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016) which seek to ensure advertisements do not harm amenity. The proposal would also fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to prevent the negative impact of poorly sited advertisements.

Other Matters

9. I recognise that the proposed digital advertisement would remove the need for regular site visits and that this would have some very minor benefits in terms of reduced fuel usage, a reduction in parking near the site and waste generation. I also recognise the digital advert would lessen the risk of any health and safety implications from the physical installation and removal of posters. However, these considerations do not outweigh the concerns which I have identified above.
10. I note that the Council have raised no public safety concerns in relation to the proposal and based on my observations of the appeal site, this is a conclusion with which I would agree. However, the lack of harm in this regard carries neutral weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR