



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2024

by Phillip J G Ware BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K5030/Z/24/3344828

Outside 81 Farringdon Street, London EC4A 4BL

- 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 In Focus Network Ltd against the decision of the City of London Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01214/ADVT, dated 8 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2024.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation and display of an internally illuminated advertisement display panel on a telephone kiosk, measuring 1.95m high and 1.2m wide at a height above ground level of 0.3m.
-

Procedural matter

1. The above description of the proposal is taken from the Council's decision notice and was adopted by the appellant on appeal. It better describes the proposal than that given on the application form.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. There is one main issue in this case. That is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area, including the setting of the Fleet Street Conservation Area and Listed Buildings in the vicinity.

Reasons

4. The proposed advert would be located on an existing phone kiosk, approved as a replacement for a previous structure, on the western pavement outside the Hoop and Grapes PH – which is itself flanked by a modern redevelopment. The kiosk presently comprises a black painted aluminium structure, open on two sides with one side filled with a non-illuminated advert panel.
5. The proposal is for an internally illuminated display panel on the side of the kiosk. The display would be an LCD screen, which would have a ten second dwell time before changing to the next static image.
6. Farringdon Street is a main north-south route, including a number of heritage assets (to which I return below) and more modern developments. From my site visit I have noticed only a limited amount of advertising material in the

- area and none which interrupt views of the streetscene or of the various heritage assets in the area.
7. The proposed advert, by reason of its siting, size and illumination, would be prominent and a visual distraction in the streetscene.
 8. Turning to the various heritage assets in the vicinity, I am obviously aware of the modern development which surrounds the Hoop and Grapes PH (Grade II). However the public house itself retains the characteristics for which it was listed and the proposed advertisement would detract from views of the asset from both sides of Farringdon Street.
 9. Looking south along Farringdon Street the eye is currently drawn to the imposing Holborn Viaduct Bridge with its associated pavilions (Grade II). This view is sensitive to any visual clutter or distraction and the proposed advertisement would harm the view and appreciation of this Victorian engineering project.
 10. To the northeast is 26 Farringdon Street (Grade II), but due to the relative scale and distance of the proposal and the asset, I am not persuaded that the appeal site is within its setting.
 11. Finally, again looking south towards the Viaduct, the observer looks into the Fleet Street Conservation Area, which is located further south on Farringdon Street closer to Ludgate Circus. For the same reason as set out above in relation to the Viaduct, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would fail the test in s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
 12. Given that this is an advertisement appeal, the Council's policies are not in themselves decisive, however they are a material consideration. For the reasons above the proposal would conflict with policies CS10 (design) and DM 10.6 (Advertisements) of the City of London Local Plan (2015), and with policy D8 (Public realm) of the London Plan (2021).

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

P. J. G. Ware

Inspector