



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2023 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/Z/23/3321200

25-35 Fishermans Walk, London E14 4DH

- 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 Partisan Work Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/23/00201/NC, dated 25 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2023.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as "1x illuminated high level signage and 2x riverside signage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of "1x illuminated high level signage and 2x riverside signage" at 25-35 Fishermans Walk, London E14 4DH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PA/23/00201/NC, dated 25 January 2023. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The advertisements were in place when I conducted my site visit. I have considered the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area, with specific regard to a listed dock.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Fishermans Walk is a quiet part of Canary Wharf, overlooking the docks. From the North Dock, the area appears to have a visual busyness, resulting from the abundance of paraphernalia on the dock edge, including seating and sheds. The advertisements are most visible from the opposite side of the dock, although are not easily visible at the same time. The grade I listed West India Dock has historical significance, with both the profile of the walls being of interest and its provenance of being one of the first enclosed security commercial docks. However, and from the evidence provided by the appellant, it would appear

that while the appeal site is within the historic dock, it is not near to the historic dock walls.

6. Taking into account the existing situation, the advertisements do not provide any additional visual clutter to the area. From Fishermans walk, the high level advertisement is not easily noticed, and does not appear overbearing. From the opposite side of the dock, it appears to be proportionate to the scale of the building and does not dominate the façade.
7. The two riverside advertisements are fixed to the balustrade of Fishermans Walk. From Fishermans Walk, the advertisements are not easily seen, with only the black backing of them visible. They are more visible from the opposite side of the dock, but are not easily seen at the same time, decreasing their group and overall visibility within the public realm. While there are no other internally illuminated riverside signs that are similar to these, against the busy background of the brightly coloured seating, they do not appear to be out of character with the dock in this area, and reflect the current use of Nos 25-35.
8. The advertisements do not therefore adversely affect the significance of the grade I listed dock and, consequently, do not have a harmful effect on visual amenity. I have taken into account Policies S.DH1, S.DH3 and D.DH10 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020), which collectively seek to ensure advertisements are well designed and do not detract from historic settings. Given I have concluded that the advertisements would not harm visual amenity, the proposal is commensurate with the aims of these policies.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject, as I have set out above, to the regulation's standard conditions.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report. On that basis the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR