



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2023

by Phillip J G Ware BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/Z/22/3311176 114 Farringdon Road, London EC1R 3AP

- 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 Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/2344/ADV, dated 14 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is a digital poster panel (6m x 3m) on the gable wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The application premises are an end of terrace three storey property at the corner of Rosebury Avenue and Farringdon Rd. The ground floor is in use for commercial purposes with, it appears, residential use above. The flank wall of the property looks out over the traffic light controlled junction of the two roads and is currently finished in white render.
3. The appellant describes the location and the flank wall as prominent, and I agree with that description. The wider area comprises a mix of commercial and residential properties, with very little advertising above street level. The area is part of the Rosebury Avenue Conservation Area. It is close to the entrance to Exmouth Market.
4. The Rosebury Avenue Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2003), though dated, gives some limited evidence on the Conservation Area. It identifies the terrace in which the appeal site is located as being of local significance.
5. The proposal is to erect a panel on the gable wall measuring 6 metres in height and 3 metres in width. It would display multiple static illuminated adverts in rotation. The appellant has noted that the sequential changes in images would increase the prominence of the display - I also agree with that assessment.
6. However, far from adding to visual interest, I consider that it would only draw further attention to what would be a discordant and prominent feature which would be at odds with the general character of the area. It would introduce flank and high-level advertising in an area virtually free of such displays, and would therefore be out of keeping with the area.

7. In coming to that view I am mindful of s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which is that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. This statutory duty applies in advertisement appeals insofar as it relates to the consideration of amenity. The appeal scheme would fail that test and would in fact be harmful to the Conservation Area.
8. The appellant has referred to the Old Street Canvas Curating Committee and has put forward a condition which would make 20% of the displays available for non-commercial uses through a content management plan. The appeal (though not the condition) has referred to this as local artwork. But even leaving aside from the fact that I am dealing with the principle of an advertisement in this location rather than its content, I am not persuaded that a small element of non-commercial material would lessen the visual harm.
9. The Islington Core Strategy (2011), at policy CS8, aims to enhance the character of the Borough. Policy DM2.1 of the Islington Development Management Policies (2013) support good design, the importance of local characteristics, and the conservation of heritage assets. Policy DM2 deals with advertising of varying types and includes the criterion that displays should be of a high quality and sensitive to visual appearance in relation to its siting (including the building or structure on which it is to be sited) and the surrounding street scene, especially in the case of conservation areas. The appeal scheme would conflict with these policies.
10. The appellant has drawn attention to locations where other such displays have been allowed. However, these differ significantly from the appeal site - one is a gable end in a residential terrace, one a street level advertisement facing the road, and one is wholly different from this more limited appeal scheme. These examples do not add to my consideration of this particular appeal.
11. The appellant has stated that the ability to display multiple campaigns would reduce demand elsewhere. However I have to deal with this proposal and I have no evidence of demand or potential other sites.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

P. J. G. Ware

Inspector