

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2022 by M Long

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/21/3284477

Superclass Express 4-5 Campsbourne Parade, High Street, Hornsey, London N8 7PR

- 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 Bektas Erdogan against the decision of The London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2522, dated 25 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The advertisement is described as 'the existing non-illuminated sign to be illuminated'.
-

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. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.
4. The submitted evidence indicates that the illuminated sign was erected prior to the application being made. The appeal has therefore been considered on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The Council has concluded that the advertisement would be acceptable in terms of public safety, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that in practice, 'amenity' is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement, and the local characteristics of the neighbourhood should always be considered. The Framework sets out that

the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

7. The appeal site is located in the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area, where special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. The site relates to the illuminated fascia sign of a ground floor supermarket on the northern side of the High Street. The surrounding area is mostly comprised of tall buildings, many of which benefit from historic architectural features, and which have ground floor commercial uses. The character of advertising in this location is varied, however most signage is associated with the ground floor commercial businesses and, on the whole, fascia signs appear to be non-illuminated.
8. The appeal scheme relates to an illuminated fascia sign of a substantial width that is positioned below the first floor level windows of the host building. The illuminated design is described by the appellant as trough lighting that is visible through holes in the fascia's background panel.
9. As the High Street contains predominantly non-illuminated fascia signs, the illuminated design of the appeal scheme would appear overly prominent in the evening and night and be an unsympathetic feature in this context. Given its substantial size and height, the illuminated advertisement is a highly visible addition within the High Street streetscene. As such, the advertisement's incongruous design has a detrimental impact upon the area's visual amenity and does not preserve the character and appearance of advertising in the Conservation Area.
10. Given the above, the advertisement results in harm to the visual amenity of the area. It is contrary to the Development Management DPD, adopted July 2017, specifically Policy DM8 which seeks to prevent shopfront signage that adversely impacts the character or appearance of a conservation area. There is conflict with Policy DM1 which seeks to ensure development proposals make a positive contribution to a place and Policy DM9 which seeks to ensure development that conserves and enhances the significance of heritage assets. There would be further conflict with Policy SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013-2026, consolidated with alterations since 2017, which seeks to ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. The advertisement would also be contrary to The London Plan, adopted March 2021, in particular Policy D8 which seeks to ensure the public-realm is well-designed and Policy HC1 which seeks to ensure development proposals affecting heritage assets should conserve their significance.

Other Matters

11. Given the relatively small scale of the sign, the advertisement does not result in direct harm to amenity with regard to the living conditions of a neighbouring resident. However, this is a neutral matter in the consideration of this appeal and does not outweigh the harm identified above to the visual amenity of the area.
12. The appellant has expressed that there was an error made in a previous application at this site with regard to the illumination of the signage. The full details of this case are not before me, however in any event this would not be directly relevant to the planning merits of the appeal scheme.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. 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