



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/24/3350310

Eastings 510943 Northing 176677, Verge prior to the Jolly Waggoners Roundabout, adjacent to The Parkway, southbound

- 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 Mrs J Woodward, Marketing Force against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2024/1617.
 - The advertisement proposed is a single free-standing, non-illuminated advertisement sited on the verge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area and public safety.

Reasons

Amenity

3. The appeal site is adjacent to the southbound carriageway of A312, at the entrance to the Jolly Waggoners Roundabout. The proposed sign would be located within a grass verge and would measure 2.4 metres wide, with an overall height of 2 metres, including posts.
4. The proposed sign would introduce visual clutter to an area of public realm which is otherwise free of advertisements. Whilst I note that the proposed advertisement would be non-illuminated, due to its size and prominent position, it would be an obtrusive and incongruous feature. As a result, it would also affect the pedestrian experience of this crossing point. For these reasons, the proposed advertisement would unacceptably impact the character and appearance of the site and setting.
5. I note the appellant's comments that the proposal would not advertise 'businesses selling/providing unethical services or products', that any damaged boards would be replaced, that no vegetation would be removed, and the signage would not include any displays similar to traffic signs. It is also stated that the sign would not affect the openness of the Green Belt and that there are no historic assets in the immediate vicinity. However, none of these matters, when considered on their own or cumulatively, would outweigh the harm that I have found to the character and appearance of the site and setting.

6. The appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on amenity and would therefore conflict with Policies CC1 and CC5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2015). Taken together, these seek to protect amenity in relation to advertisements so are relevant in this case. For the same reason, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Public Safety

7. The proposed sign would be located in a grass verge adjacent to an area of footpath where pedestrians stand whilst attempting to cross the A312. I recognise that this sign would not block pedestrian movement. However, given the size and location of the proposed sign, it would obstruct pedestrian views of oncoming southbound traffic. Also, whilst it would not interfere with views of on-coming traffic for south bound vehicles entering the roundabout, it would inhibit views of pedestrians seeking to cross this busy 4 lane carriageway. Consequently, the proposal would result in undue harm to pedestrian safety.
8. The appellant's explanation for why they consider 'the argument about the sign obscuring pedestrian vision is not a valid reason for objection' appears to refer to the situation for pedestrians crossing the A4 arm of the roundabout, rather than the A312. Nonetheless, I acknowledge that two other arms of the roundabout include an underpass and a pedestrian crossing, which offer safer options for pedestrians to traverse the roundabout. I also note that there is no record of pedestrian casualties in the vicinity of the roundabout. However, this is not sufficient justification for the proposed advertisement to worsen the level of pedestrian safety at a crossing point on the very busy 4 lane carriageway at this junction.
9. I recognise that TfL's comments on the proposal do not consider pedestrian safety. However, in the face of observations on my site visit, as well as all other evidence before me, I am of the view that the proposed advertisement would unduly harm pedestrian safety.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's assertion that there is no clear link between the presence of advertisements and traffic collisions and the information they have submitted in support of this view. I also note the Crashmap data on vehicle accident levels in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, the harm I have found relates to pedestrian safety, rather than traffic collisions. Consequently, I have attached limited weight to these matters in considering the appeal.
11. I recognise that commercial adverts are included on the central island of the Jolly Waggoners Roundabout. Nevertheless, they significantly differ from the appeal proposal. The roundabout signs are smaller than the proposed advert and they do not interfere with pedestrian safety. I have also considered a number of examples of signage within the wider nation also cited by the appellant. However, I have very limited information before me regarding that signage. Also, in respect of all these examples, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. Taking account of all the above, I have attached limited weight to these alternative advertisements in considering the appeal.
12. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would prejudice conditions of public safety and would therefore conflict with LP Policies CC5 and

EC2. Taken together, these seek to avoid adverse impacts on the transport network, including pedestrian movement or safety, so are relevant in this case.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has submitted details of their wider business interests within the UK. However, I have determined this appeal on its merits, and this does not outweigh or overcome my conclusion on the main issues.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR