
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2022 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/Z/22/3295438

14 - 22 Vale Royal and 184 York Way, London, N7 9AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant :planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jon Dingle on behalf of Access Self-Storage against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/3535/ADV, dated 30 November 2021 was refused by notice dated 27 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is Illuminated fascia signs on north and south elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Illuminated fascia signs on north and south elevations at 14 - 22 Vale Royal and 184 York Way, London, N7 9AD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2021/3535/ADV, dated 30 November 2021 and subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional condition:

1)The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 143-RHA-01-ZZ-DR-A-0001 Site Location Plan, 143-RHA-01-ZZ-DR-A-8000 B Proposed North Elevation, 143-RHA-01-ZZ-DR-A-8001 D Proposed South Elevation.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and where appropriate public safety, taking account of any material factors. The Council has drawn my attention to policies it considers relevant to this appeal, and I have taken them into account as a material consideration though they have not, by themselves, been decisive in my determination.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a six-storey commercial building. The immediate surroundings have a busy, mixed commercial and residential character, with substantial buildings and features including an embankment and a railway bridge directly adjacent to the appeal site. There are existing signs, albeit these are limited in number throughout the area, including those noted on the appeal building which contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal seeks two illuminated fascia signs. The first proposed sign would be located on the north facing elevation of the projecting stair-well located on the front of the appeal building. Despite the substantial scale of this proposed sign, when viewed from along York Way, it would be seen in combination with the previous approved ¹ fascia signs and against the high-level and more substantial railway bridge beyond. It would not, therefore, appear as an overly large feature or at odds with the commercial character of the existing building or its immediate surroundings. As such, it would not add unnecessary clutter or unsightly proliferation to the appeal building or surrounding area.
5. In terms of its proposed levels of illumination, the proposal would be splayed towards the northbound traffic along York Way. The levels of illumination would be in keeping with the previously approved signage and as such would not compete with or increase levels over and above what has already been considered acceptable. Furthermore, given its siting it would not intrude into the residential block which is located some distance away on the opposite side of the highway. Whilst it may draw the eye due to the method of display, the proposed levels of illumination would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood of the site.
6. Comments were received from a nearby resident who noted that residents located on the lower floors of the nearby residential building experience issues from light pollution as a result of the nearby railway sidings and the proposed signage would add to this. However, for the reasons discussed above, it is considered that the proposed levels of illumination would not have an adverse effect on the outlook from the nearby residential units thus preserving the surrounding visual amenity.
7. The second proposed sign would be located on the south facing elevation of the appeal building which overlooks the railway line. The proposal here would consist of back lit individual letters spelling out 'access self storage'. Visibility would be restricted and limited to intermittent views to oncoming traffic and passing trains. Given its proposed design and siting, it is considered there would be no adverse effects on the visual amenity of the site or surrounding area.
8. Overall, I find that the proposals would be of a high quality and in keeping with the building and surrounding amenity. They would not appear incongruous or unduly prominent, and as such, would not result in the undue cluttering of the existing elevations of the appeal site. Accordingly, they would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the area.
9. Consequently, insofar as they are material considerations in the determination of this matter, there is no conflict with Policies DM2.1 and DM2.6 of the

¹ P2021/1972/ADV

Islington Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP) which seek proposals to be of a high-quality design and sensitive to its visual appearance in relation to its siting and surrounding street scene. The Council refused the proposal against Policy DM2.3 of the DMP, however, this policy relates to heritage and is not considered material in the determination of this case.

Conditions

10. Alongside the standard conditions to be attached, a condition defining the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
11. The Council has suggested an additional condition to control the level of illumination to 436 candelas per square metre. However, the details contained with the application specify the levels of illumination for each of the proposed signs. A further condition specifying this information is not, therefore, necessary or reasonable.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the proposals are acceptable in terms of amenity, it is recommended that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the five standard conditions and the additional one as set out above.

S Witherley

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.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR