



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/Z/23/3317704

65A Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7PL

- 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. Khalid Mushtaq against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref PA/22/02148, dated 14 October 2022 was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is for an externally illuminated commercial banner set within an illustrated scaffold shroud.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 Matters

3. I have had regard to the Framework and its relevance to the consideration of proposals for advertisement consent. I have also had regard to the policies of the development plan insofar as they are material considerations relevant to the main issue.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity with specific regard to the Whitechapel High Street Conservation Area (CA) and the setting of listed buildings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is predominantly older low-rise buildings of around three to five storeys in height. Architecture varies albeit there is commonality and quality in scale. The appeal site is at the entrance of the CA, forming something of a gateway in terms of street views. The significance of the CA in built form terms is derived from its architectural and historical merits, having once been a main transit route. While No 65A is not listed, there are a number of nationally and locally listed buildings nearby which, owing to their architectural quality and originality, contribute positively to the CA.
6. The commercial buildings on the high street have noticeably discreet advertisements and general signage which are not excessive in size or number

terms. Their scale is concordant with and respectful to the buildings. The proposed advertisement would be a large example in itself. It would, as a result, be discordant with the host building and stand out unacceptably against the more modest local signage. It would also be positioned noticeably higher than others in the area.

7. No 65A is in a prominent location, with its side elevation being clearly visible when transiting through the High Street. Accordingly, the advertisement would be in a highly visible location when entering the street. Central House, located outside of the CA but adjacent to the appeal site, is set further back from the road than the site, which creates even longer views of the end wall of No 65A.
8. The grade II* listed Whitechapel Art Gallery, grade II listed 88 Whitechapel High Street and the Whitechapel Public Library are large prominent buildings in the local street scene. Not only are they fine architectural examples of their type, their size and presentation to the street within their urban context forms an important part of their setting. Local advertisements tend to respect this prominence and are much more recessive, allowing appreciation of the buildings' qualities. The largeness of the proposals and their highly prominent siting would compete visually with the buildings, detracting from their architectural quality.
9. Accordingly, the proposed advertisement would fail to preserve or enhance the CA and would harm the setting of listed buildings. Thus, it would be unacceptable in visual amenity terms. I have taken into account Policies D.DH10 and S.DH3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031, which seek to ensure advertisements do not have a negative impact on visual amenity within a historical context. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm visual amenity, the proposal would conflict with the aims of these policies.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR