



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2023 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/23/3317840

110 Power Road, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 5PY

- 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 John Caney (Endeavour Automotive Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 00890/110/AD1, dated 11 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The advertisement is the installation of two externally illuminated fascia signs and one non-illuminated fascia sign
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the installation of two externally illuminated fascia signs and one non-illuminated fascia sign as applied for. 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 Matters

3. The Government published on 19 December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a relevant factor, in this instance, the issues most relevant to this advertisement appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
4. The description of development on the application form also refers to alterations and an infill extension at the appeal site, as a joint application was submitted. Those elements were subject to separate consideration. I have therefore taken the description above from the Council's decision notice and the appeal statement as it accurately describes the nature of this appeal scheme.

Main Issue

5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into

account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.

6. The Council concluded that the advertisement would be acceptable in terms of public safety, and from the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that in practice, 'amenity' is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement, and the local characteristics of the neighbourhood should always be considered. The Framework sets out that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
8. This commercial car dealership is in a locally significant Industrial History Site. The area contains a variety of advertisement styles, including illuminated and non-illuminated designs. The appeal building has undergone substantial alterations allowed at appeal¹, including a ground floor showroom with large, glazed openings and wooden cladding. During the site visit I observed that the three appeal advertisements were already on display, as shown on the submitted plans.
9. The large 'Ineos Grenadier' sign has been positioned over two first-floor front windows. While this placement may have had an unbalancing effect on the building prior to its extension and alteration, the new showroom has significantly reduced the former symmetry of the front elevation. Consequently, this sign does not have a harmfully unbalancing effect but rather appears as an acceptable addition to the building.
10. There were also first-floor windows on another elevation that would offer sufficient light to the affected room. Therefore, I do not consider there has been a harmful reduction of amenity for users of the property.
11. The other two signs are viewed in the immediate context of the adjacent showroom. Their size and positioning mean they have a limited impact within the wider streetscene, and they appear in keeping with the varied character of advertising in this location. As such, they have not resulted in any significant harm to the amenity of the building or Industrial History Site.
12. Accordingly, the advertisements do not result in harm to the amenity of the area. I have taken account of the Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted September 2015) specifically Policy CC5 which seeks advertisements that respect their context with suitable regard to considerations of amenity, and so is material in this case. Policy CC1 also expects proposals to respond to the wider context and history of an area. Given I have concluded that the advertisements have not harmed amenity, they do not conflict with these policies.

Conditions

13. The five standard conditions as set out in the Regulations will apply.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3311236

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and agree with the reasoning set out above. On that basis the appeal is allowed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR