



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: 21 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/Z/22/3308841

Bank Buildings, Fulham Broadway, London, SW6 1EP

- 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 Sam Harrison against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2022/00593/ADV, dated 28 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of a temporary scaffold shroud with replica of building façade to front elevation, including an externally illuminated advertisement panel.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The Regulations and paragraph 136 of the *National Planning Policy 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 both amenity and public safety.
3. As such, the main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area; and
 - The effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety.

Reasons

Amenity

4. The appeal building faces the junction of Fulham Broadway, Fulham Road, Harwood Road and Effie Road. The space created by the junction is expansive in an area otherwise characterised by its dense urban environment. The appeal building is taller than its neighbours with an impressive and detailed façade, and consequently stands out in views across the junction.
5. The proposed advertisement would incorporate a shroud and panel. Given the characteristics that I have described, these would be highly visible, and the addition of a large advertisement would be a new feature in the area. Although there are two noticeable instances of advertisements above façade level on other buildings around the junction, these are limited to lettering of the names of businesses. The advertisement would therefore be incongruous and, due to its large size and prominent position, would appear obtrusive.

6. The site is within the Walham Green Conservation Area and close to the other designated heritage assets of Fulham Broadway Underground Station and Fulham Town Hall. Although there is a high level of activity around the area, the general absence of advertising above façade level enables an appreciation of the particular characteristics of both the Conservation Area and the individual assets within their setting. The introduction of a large shroud advertisement in such a visible location would detract from this appreciation and have a detrimental impact on the heritage assets and their setting.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful impact on the amenity of the area.

Public safety

8. The road junction which the proposed advertisement would face is a four-way junction set at irregular angles. Although traffic speeds were slow at the time of my visit and limited to 20 kilometres per hour, the volume of traffic passing through the intersection was high. I noticed during my inspection, which was in the late morning, that there were many pedestrians around the junction. This resulted in pavement congestion, particularly around the signalled crossings. There was also a significant number of pedestrians crossing roads amongst moving and stationary vehicles away from the marked crossings.
9. Given the unusual and complicated layout and busy nature of this junction, further distractions to highway users would be unwelcome and potentially detrimental to safety. The introduction of new advertising above façade level in an area where such advertising is currently limited would be a distraction for road users.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful impact on public safety.

Other considerations

11. The Council has drawn my attention to its *Local Plan* (2018) Policies DC8, DC9 and T6, and its *Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document* (2018) Key Principles BM1, BM2, AH1, AH2 and TR28, which it considers to be relevant to this appeal. I have taken these into account as a consideration. However, given that the Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and/or public safety, these policies have not been a decisive consideration in my decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR