



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2023

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/Z/23/3316393

186 Holland Park Avenue, London W11 4UJ

- 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 Ms Judy Taylor against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
- The application Ref CA/22/07495, dated 6 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2023.
- The advertisement proposed is an illuminated 1:1 shroud display incorporating a commercial display on the west elevation only.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of an illuminated 1:1 shroud display incorporating a commercial display on the west elevation only, at 186 Holland Park Avenue, London, W11 4UJ. The consent is for one year from the date of this decision and is subject to standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The hoarding and shroud on which the advertisement would be displayed is in place. The planning history submitted by both the appellant and the Council indicates that advertisements and public art have previously been applied to the shroud in accordance with what appear to be the dimensions proposed in this appeal. However, on the day of my visit, there was no advertisement or any other display on the shroud. Accordingly, I refer to the advertisement as proposed, rather than existing.

Main Issue

3. The Regulations and paragraph 136 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) confine my assessment of this appeal for advertisement consent to matters of amenity and public safety, taking into account any other relevant factors, including cumulative impact. In this instance, the Council refused consent for reasons of amenity. As such, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The existing externally illuminated hoarding and shroud conceals the upper three storeys of the side of the building and is on the end of a terrace. It faces the expanse of the Holland Park Roundabout from which Holland Park Avenue leads. The roads in the area are busy and, with the exception of the terrace on which the hoarding is erected, most other buildings visible when viewing the shroud are of modern styles.

5. The hoarding and shroud conceals the end of the terrace at 180-186 Holland Park Avenue (Nos. 180-186) and from the evidence before me is in a poor state. I understand that there is an intention for it to mask long-planned repair works, which do not appear to have started. As such, an advertisement has been displayed on the shroud for several years, similar to the dimensions and appearance of the appeal proposal.
6. In most views of the hoarding and shroud, the foreground is visually cluttered and has a high level of traffic and activity. The proposed advertisement would not greatly increase the existing amount of clutter and the experience of those viewing the advertisement would not be significantly changed.
7. Views of the shroud from within and including the Norland Conservation Area, in which the proposed advertisement is located, are dominated by the foreground activity. Despite the hoarding being attached to the side of the listed buildings comprising the terrace of Nos. 180-186, these remain clearly identifiable in public views, and no important features of their facades are obscured by or in competition with the shroud. The addition of an advertisement to the shroud would have minimal effect. Accordingly, the advertisement would not have a significantly harmful impact on the heritage assets or their setting.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would not have a harmful impact on the amenity of the area. The Council has drawn my attention to its *Local Plan* (2019) Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL4 and CR4, *Norland Neighbourhood Plan* (2012) Policies N4 and N8, and *The London Plan* (2021) Policies D8 and HC1, which it considers to be relevant to this appeal. Given my conclusion that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies or the Framework.

Conditions

9. I have applied the standard conditions specified in the Regulations. Consent is granted for a one-year period, in recognition of the temporary nature of the hoarding and shroud, and the appellant's stated intention to complete the works within this period.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR