



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K5030/Z/24/3355353

Pavement o/s 60 Holborn Viaduct, London EC1A 2FD

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by New World Payphones against the decision of City of London Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00374/ADVT.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 no. Digital advertisement display within proposed New Communications Kiosk.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1 no. Digital advertisement display within proposed New Communications Kiosk at Pavement o/s 60 Holborn Viaduct, London EC1A 2FD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00374/ADVT, dated 10 April 2024. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application for advertisement consent was submitted to the Council alongside an application¹ for planning permission for the installation of a new telecommunications kiosk with integrated advertisement display and the removal of three existing associated telephone kiosks. Whilst the Council refused advertisement consent, it granted planning permission for the kiosk. On the site visit I saw that this was yet to be implemented.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies on the north side of Holborn Viaduct close to a bus shelter and in front of a large predominantly glazed and contemporary styled building. A building with a similar character comprising of a canopied frontage forms the entrance to the City Thameslink Station to the opposite side of the road. This includes multiple retail units within its frontage which incorporate modern internally illuminated signage into its frontage. I saw on my site visit that large modern buildings were under construction adjacent to the station building and alongside the building that faces the appeal site.

¹ Ref 24/00373/FULL.

5. Further along the frontage of the station building, away from the appeal site, there is a bus shelter which incorporates a large LED screen advertisement to one end. I saw a similar bus shelter with a large LED screen on the opposite side of the viaduct adjacent to 50 Holborn Viaduct.
6. The streetscene in the vicinity of the appeal site is thus one of large modern buildings incorporating high levels of glazing. LED screen advertisements are also a feature of this street, as are illuminated advertisements.
7. The proposed digital display would be located to the back of the telephone kiosk. It would portray static advertising images that change sequentially every 10 seconds. The appellant sets out that the digital display would operate in accordance with Professional Lighting Guide 05 'The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (2023). On this basis, during the daytime, the in-built sensor control system adjusts the display luminance to suit the prevailing ambient light levels, meaning lower display luminance when ambient light levels are lower. After dark, the display operates at a very low luminance level, not exceeding 300 candela per square metre, and is turned off between midnight and 0500 hours.
8. Seen against the backdrop of the aforementioned contemporary architecture and in the context of the existing advertisements here, I am not convinced that the modern appearance of the proposed digital advertisement display, incorporated into a telephone kiosk, would appear incongruous or visually intrusive. Furthermore, given the urban location, prevalence of existing illuminated advertisements and the proposed luminance levels, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in any noticeable light pollution or light spill.
9. Whilst there are existing LED screens present within the streetscene, I would note that the distance between these and the appeal site is sufficient in order to avoid giving the impression of a proliferation of this form of advertisement.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would preserve the visual amenity of the area. Policies CS10, DM10.6 and DM15.7 of the City of London Local Plan (2015) and Policy D8 of The London Plan (2021) seek to, amongst other things, protect visual amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm visual amenity, the proposal complies with the provisions of the Policies insofar as they relate to that matter.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR