



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/Z/21/3289888

Northside House, Mount Pleasant, Cockfosters EN4 9EE

- 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 Anthony Pepe against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/03412/ADV, dated 30 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is for an illuminated fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of the illuminated fascia sign 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has referenced policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken these into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (The Regulations) to control advertisements may only be exercised in the interests of visual amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. Consequently, the Council's policies have not by themselves been decisive in my determination.
3. The advertisement is already being displayed. I shall take this into account within this appeal.
4. The address given on the appeal form and application form is inaccurate with respect to its postcode. I have therefore taken the postcode from the Council's Decision Notice that seems to reflect the location of the site.

Main Issue

5. Paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. The Council has not raised any public safety concerns and I have no reason to disagree.
6. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the advertisement upon the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is occupied by a four-storey building containing a restaurant at ground floor and offices above. Northside House is a post-war building with elevations that largely consist of brick and render panels. Windows are arranged in a regular horizontal pattern enclosed by a grid formation defined by concrete surrounds and rendered panels. The building includes a vertical brick section around its corner that adds interest to the structure.
8. The appeal site is adjacent to the junction of Cockfosters Road and Mount Pleasant, within Cockfosters Parade. The parade is part of a larger local centre providing a diverse range of commercial activities. Signage within the parade includes of internally illuminated fascia and projecting signs. The signage contributes to the commercial character of the wider area.
9. The proposed signage is displayed in between the first and second floor windows of the building and identifies its occupiers. The advertisement is directly beneath a group of five windows, closest to the corner, and covers five rendered panels. It does not, therefore, conceal the brick corner feature and appears modest in comparison to the size of the elevation. The width of the signage is proportionate to the scale of the building and fits neatly within its established window formation. As a result, the building and its architectural features frame the signage in an integrated manner.
10. Although located above the established signage zone of Cockfosters Parade, the advertisement is within an active commercial frontage and would complement the existing commercial character of the area. The sign, whilst internally illuminated, appears to replicate the design of several local signs within shop fronts and would complement existing illumination in the area. Furthermore, being sited within the frontage of a large format building the sign would not result in visual clutter and being in relatively unique position would be unlikely to set a poor precedent for future advertisements.
11. Moreover, it is unlikely that the advertisement is of sufficient scale or illumination to be intrusive to future occupiers of the residential development coming forward opposite Cockfosters Road.
12. Accordingly, the proposed advertisement would complement the amenity of the local area. As such, the proposal would accord with paragraphs 130 and 136 of the Framework, which requires development to be sympathetic to the local area and for the decision maker to consider the effect of advertisements on amenity. In accordance with the Regulations, I have also taken into account the provision of the development plan so far as it is material. The proposal would comply with Policy D4 of the London Plan, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), and policies DMD37 and DMD 41 of the Enfield Development Plan Document (2014). These require, among other matters, for advertisements to be appropriate to the premises and streetscene.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR