



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/22/3305490

250 Gunnersbury Avenue (North Circular Road), Hounslow, London W4 5QB

- 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 Justin Myers (Blow Up Media UK Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00535/250/AD4, dated 23 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as a temporary decorative scaffold shroud advertisement comprising a 1:1 image of the building façade with an inset advertising and information area measuring 15 metres x 6 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of a decorative scaffold shroud advertisement comprising a 1:1 image of the building façade with an inset advertising and information area measuring 15 metres x 6 metres as applied for. The consent is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations, and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The express consent hereby granted shall begin on the date of the commencement of the display, or 6 months from the date of this decision, whichever is the sooner.
 - 2) The temporary decorative scaffold shroud advertisement permitted by this consent shall be removed from the site no later than 12 months from first display, or on completion of the building works, whichever is the sooner.
 - 3) The intensity of illumination of the temporary decorative scaffold shroud advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 300 candelas per square metre.

Procedural Matters

2. The Regulations are clear that powers should be exercised only 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. I have considered the appeal on this basis, and I have framed the main issue accordingly.

3. In an informative attached to its decision the Council states that the scaffold itself would require planning permission. Be that as it may, I have dealt with this appeal on the basis of the refusal of advertisement consent.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a large, currently vacant, office building, which is set back from Gunnersbury Avenue behind a lawn and immature trees. It sits in a commercial area, amongst busy roads and substantial buildings, including a car showroom and a retail warehouse. Whilst there are nearby advertisements and signs, including large, illuminated advertisements on an elevated section of the M4, I did not observe any comparable in scale and appearance to this scheme.
6. The appellant sets out that consent is required for a temporary period of twelve months whilst building works are carried out to the property.
7. The shroud would depict a 1:1 image of the building's façade. Only a relatively modest proportion of it would comprise the static advertisement and information area. Notwithstanding that, the advertisement would be a large and fairly dominant feature in this prominent location facing Gunnersbury Avenue. However, in the context of this busy, commercial area, with many large buildings, it would not appear markedly out of place. In comparison to views of building works, the proposal would have a positive impact on the streetscene whilst they are undertaken.
8. In reaching that conclusion I have had regard to the stance in the National Planning Practice Guidance at ID: 18b-005-20140306, which sets out that 'buildings which are being renovated or are undergoing major structural work and which have scaffolding or netting around them may be considered suitable as temporary sites for shroud advertisements or large 'wrap' advertisements covering the face, or part of the face, of the building.'
9. I have also taken into account Policies CC1 and CC5 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2015). Amongst other things, these expect development to respond to local character and context, and state that advertisements should be of a high quality design, and should not be obtrusive. However, Policy CC5 also notes that temporary shrouds can make a positive contribution to an area's appearance during construction works. These policies are thus material in this case. As I have found that this temporary shroud would have a positive impact on amenity during the construction works, it would not conflict with them.
10. As the quality and character of the area would not suffer, having regard to cumulative impacts, the proposed temporary decorative scaffold shroud advertisement would not conflict with the approach at paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The appeal will therefore be allowed.
11. The consent is subject to the five standard conditions. As the proposed advertisement is acceptable only on a temporary basis whilst building works are carried out, having regard to Section 14(8) of the Regulations I have

imposed my condition No 1, broadly as suggested by the appellant. For a similar reason, my condition No 2 is also necessary.

12. Finally, as suggested by both principal parties, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, and of vehicular and pedestrian safety, a condition is necessary setting out the maximum permitted illumination intensity. Given that requirement, I see no cogent reason to refer to advice in Technical Report No 5, by the Institution of Lighting Engineers, which in any event has been replaced.
13. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposed temporary decorative scaffold shroud advertisement would not harm the amenity of the area and the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR