



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 May 2023

by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/W/22/3308485

Pavement outside 34 Station Road, Harrow HA2 7SE

- 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 Mr Thomas Johnston (J C Decaux UK Ltd) against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/2439/22, dated 29 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2022.
- The development proposed is the installation of a modern, multifunction Hub unit featuring an integral advertisement display and defibrillator.

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/H/22/3308487

Pavement outside 34 Station Road, Harrow HA2 7SE

- 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 Thomas Johnston (J C Decaux UK Ltd) against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2481/22, dated 29 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of freestanding LCD sign.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for the proposed hub. Appeal B is in respect of refusal of advertisement consent for the LCD signage which would be an integral part of the proposed hub sought under Appeal A. I have considered both on their individual merits. However, to avoid repetition, I have dealt with the relevant issues concurrently, except where otherwise indicated.
3. Powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of Appeal B, the policy referred to me by the Council has not therefore, by itself, been decisive.
4. In Appeal B, I have taken the description of the proposed advertisement from the Council's Decision Notice as this is a more accurate description.

Main Issues

5. The main issue in the appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the locality.

Reasons

6. The site is located close to the kerb line of a pavement area on the eastern side of Station Road. It lies adjacent to a parking bay close to a busy signalised junction with Pinner Road. The area about the crossroads is characterised by retail and commercial units at ground floor, with residential accommodation above street level. The buildings are set immediately to the back of the wide pavement
7. The parking refuge is one of two consecutive bays taking up much of the length between the junction and a commerce centre close to the railway. Between the junction and end of the bays are a range of street furniture items including a CCTV pole, street lights, litter bins, bollards, cycle stands, parking meter, parking signage, electronics cabinet, a community partnership notice board, a combined communications hub/advertising unit and a freestanding double-sided internally illuminated advertising unit.
8. These existing features are spaced along the bays but are in rough alignment close to the edge of the pavement. The introduction of another sizeable structure and display within the existing line of street furniture would create a sense of visual clutter that would reduce the quality of this part of the streetscene.
9. Furthermore, seen in conjunction with existing building mounted adverts, signage attached to lamp posts, forecourt 'A' boards, street signage and the existing information and advertisement displays, even when accounting for the wide streetscape and predominant commercial character of the area, the cumulative effect of advertising would appear excessive. It would compound the cluttering effect to become a detracting aspect of the visual amenity of the area.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal under Appeal A would conflict with Policies D3 and D8 of The London Plan [2021], Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy [2012] and Policies DM1 and DM49 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies [2013] as they require development to respond positively to the local context, provide an attractive public realm, minimise effects on amenity and avoid detrimental impacts on the character and appearance of locations.
11. Furthermore, it would cause harm to the visual amenity of the locality. It would thereby conflict with Policy DM5 of the DMP and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

12. The hub could provide improved high quality, reliable telecommunications connectivity through wi-fi, 4G and 5G capacities. It could offer opportunities for smart city applications, connecting with community and emergency services and the display of announcements by those or other organisations. It could offer services to the public including wayfinding, device-charging and landline calls, for example. These are benefits that are supported by the National Planning Policy Framework. However, in a locality where there are existing hubs providing similar services the weight to those benefits is limited.
13. The proposal could provide economic benefits to local and other businesses through advertising. It would incorporate a defibrillator for use in emergencies

in conjunction with a partnership roll-out programme to improve their geographical availability. Furthermore, those facilities would be available without direct cost to the public purse and prioritise the use of renewable energy sources. These are also benefits in favour of the development.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the proposals would be harmful to the visual amenity of the locality through its effects on the character and appearance of the area. In an area already served by hub units, I find the extent of benefits that would arise would not outweigh the identified harm. There would be conflict with the development plan read as a whole and the requirement to control advertisements in the interests of amenity. Accordingly, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR