



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/21/3284430

Land adjacent 946 Great West Road, Brentford, TW8 9HF

- 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 Thomas Johnston (JCDecaux UK Ltd) against London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/EH/AD7, dated 3 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is removal of the existing landscape advertisement hoarding, measuring approximately 12mx3m and the installation of an internally illuminated free standing digital advertisement, measuring approximately 6m x 3m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the removal of the existing landscape advertisement hoarding, measuring approximately 12mx3m and the installation of an internally illuminated free standing digital advertisement, measuring approximately 6m x 3m 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 and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) No individual advertisements displayed on the panel shall contain moving images, animation, video or full motion images or images that resemble road signs or traffic signs.
 - 2) The interval between successive displays shall be instantaneous (0.1 seconds or less) with no flashing, a smooth instant change into the next static poster image, and the complete screen shall change. There shall be no visual effects including swiping or other animated transition methods between successive displays.
 - 3) The illuminated advertisement hereby consented shall not exceed a luminance of 300 cd/m².
 - 4) The sequential advertisement on any display panel shall not change more than once every ten seconds.

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 in the appeal is the effect of the development on the amenity of the Great West Road and the local area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on a grassed area of land adjacent to the Great West Road, a busy A class road, and Shield Drive, an exit only road for the West Cross Industrial Park. The proposal is for an internally illuminated digital advertisement which would replace an existing internally illuminated advertisement located on the appeal site. The surrounding area is commercial in nature, with a number of large two to three storey warehouse, retail and storage units lining Great West Road. There are a small number of trees located behind the existing advertisement display.
5. The proposed advert would face east, targeted at occupants of vehicles travelling westbound on the Great West Road, although the structure would also be visible to some extent to eastbound traffic.
6. On the opposite side of the road to the appeal site are two Grade II listed buildings which are in commercial use. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.
7. The existing advertisement display has been in place for some time and appears to be a well-established feature of this part of the street scene. The Council contend that the digital nature and the additional height of the proposed advertisement would be a harmful intrusion to the area. However, the increase in the height of the advert would be minimal (0.16m increase) and imperceptible in the context of the large commercial buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site. In addition, the width of the advert would be reduced from 12m x 3m to 6m x 3m so the overall scale of the advert would be reduced.
8. With regard to the Council's concerns relating to the introduction of a digital advert, I consider the difference between displaying a single illuminated advert in this location and a sequence of illuminated digital adverts, which includes no special effects, animation or movement, would not increase the prominence or visual clutter of the advert so as to have a materially harmful effect on the amenity of the area. Whilst I note that there would be an increase in the level of daytime illuminance compared to the existing advert, the appellant has confirmed the proposed illumination is in line with advice set out by the Institute of Lighting Professionals and in this commercial and industrial context would not be harmful to amenity.
9. Given the listed buildings are located on the other side of Great West Road, I am satisfied that they do not form part of the immediate setting of the appeal site and the proposed advertisement would not therefore adversely impact the setting of the heritage assets. For these reasons, I have found that the proposal would not conflict with Section 66 of The Act.
10. Whilst not determinative, I have had regard to Policy CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) (the 'Local Plan') which seek, amongst other things to ensure good design appropriate to the surroundings and Policy CC4 which seeks to conserve the borough's heritage

assets. I have also had regard to Local Plan Policy CC5 which requires advertisements to be appropriately designed and sited and not adversely impact on the setting of heritage assets. As the advert would not harm amenity, it would not conflict with these policies or the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to prevent the negative impact of poorly sited advertisements.

Conditions

11. In addition to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations, in the interests of public safety and amenity, I have imposed conditions controlling the content and level of illumination, sequencing and length of displays.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Elizabeth Davies

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 allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR