



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/Z/24/3344665

75 Ridley Road, Hackney, London E8 2NP

- 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 Emerald Outdoor Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0530.
 - The advertisement proposed is a non-illuminated 48 sheet static wooden billboard.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered 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.
3. The Council has referred to development plan policies contained within the London Plan (2021) and Hackney Local Plan 2033 (2020) (HLP). HLP Policy LP7, Advertisements, is material in this case. It states that advertisements must not, amongst other things, contribute to an unsightly proliferation or clutter of signage in the local area or detract from the amenity of the street scene.
4. The advertisement described above is in place and therefore this appeal relates to an application for retrospective consent.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is situated towards one end of a busy pedestrianised street that accommodates shops and a popular market selling food, clothes, homeware and a plethora of other goods. The shops and market stalls, the shop awnings and signage, and the preponderance of graffiti and street art give the area a colourful, vibrant, urban appearance that reflects the character of the wider central Dalston area. This contributes to a strong sense of place, a matter to which I attach significant weight.

7. The appeal property forms the end of a terrace and has a brick flank wall, the upper part of which is very evident in views looking west along Ridley Road and from St Marks Rise. This flank wall was previously largely covered in colourful graffiti. The appeal scheme, a large non-illuminated 48 sheet static wooden billboard, has been installed on top of this graffiti, some of which is visible below the billboard. The appellant has advised that the wall was previously occupied by a billboard at some unstated point in the past.
8. Whilst the area is commercial and includes an array of signage, this signage directly relates to the shops and market stalls and forms part of the rich local character of the area. The appeal scheme by contrast provides a large and prominent area for the display of advertisements for large national and multinational brands. Due to its size and siting, combined with the nature of the advertisements, the appeal scheme is an incongruous element in the street scene that is at odds with the strong local character of the area.
9. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal scheme has an unacceptable effect on visual amenity. I have taken into account the policies identified above which are material to this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, it follows that it conflicts with these policies.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR