The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2022

by Graham Stallwood BA(Hons) DipTP MBA FRTPI MCMI FRSA

Appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/22/3303718
1 Parkfield Parade, High Street, FELTHAM, TW13 4HJ

- 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 Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 00609/C1/AD2, dated 21 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2022.
- The advertisement proposed is an upgrade of the existing advert to support a digital poster

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council refers to Local Plan policies in its decision. I have taken these into account, but only so far as they are material to interests of amenity and public safety, as required by the Regulations.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

4. The appeal site already displays a non-illuminated traditional paper advertisement fixed to the side wall of a two-storey terrace containing retail and restaurant uses at ground floor level and residential uses above. Those ground floor commercial uses have advertisements at fascia level and some smaller projecting advertisements above. Some of the advertisements for these commercial uses are illuminated internally, and some externally, but the level of illumination is relatively low.

5. To the left of the appeal site, and immediately adjacent it, is a three-storey building containing flats called The Vineyards. The windows in its front elevation face the road over a residents' parking area. The two vertical sets of windows on the right side of the building are close to the advertisement, at right angles to it. The immediate area surrounding the site has a mixed residential and commercial character.

6. The size and siting of the proposed advertisement would be the same as the existing advertisement, although its protrusion from the building would be slightly reduced. The main difference resulting from the proposal would be that the advertisement would be digital.

7. The appellant's supporting evidence explains how, during daylight hours, modern technology ensures the appearance of the advertisement can be almost indistinguishable from traditional paper advertisements. The display automatically adjusts its brightness to reflect the environment and the content of individual advertisements being shown.

8. During darker hours the screen will automatically dim further. Between the hours of 11pm and 6am the advertisement would be turned off. Nonetheless, the screen would emit light during darker hours before and after the switched off hours at a location and scale from where light is not currently emitted. During these hours the light associated with the advertisement would convey a noticeably more overt commercial character than the current advertisement. This would be particularly apparent when travelling south-west along High Street and from the two closest vertical sets of windows in The Vineyards. For these reasons, the proposed advertisement would be materially detrimental to amenity.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has highlighted other benefits from the proposal, such as reductions in paper and paste use and a reduced need for operatives to visit the site. No resulting specific benefits to amenity or public safety have been drawn to my attention to weigh against my conclusions above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Stallwood