



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/Z/24/3352806

125 Kilburn High Road, Brent, London NW6 6JH

- 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 Ms Anna McAree (Build Hollywood Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/2103.
 - The advertisement proposed is timber billboard (non-illuminated) standard 48 sheet size 6 x 3 metres for general printed poster advertising.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 advertisement is already in place and consent to display the advertisement is therefore sought retrospectively.
4. The control of advertisements is confined to the issues of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding public safety. Having regard to the available evidence, I see no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity, with particular regard to the significance of the locally listed building at 125 Kilburn High Road (no 125).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site lies on a high traffic road with ground floor commercial units and upper floor residential dwellings. The surrounding area generates heavy pedestrian traffic, with Kilburn Market, a vibrant, open ground floor market space, in close vicinity to the appeal site. The buildings on Kilburn High Road have varying construction periods, creating a mix of modern and traditional façades. Advertisements are found predominantly on shopfronts and bus shelters in the area.

7. The appeal site is located on the flank wall of no 125, a Public House, which is locally listed. Although not located within a conservation area, the Victorian baroque building has been licenced since 1486. Its red brick walls and white stone finish create an attractive façade with highly distinct decorative elements. The building was rebuilt in 1900 and remains primarily unaltered. Amidst the busy high street, no 125 is a historic landmark distinctive in its baroque design, which is of high significance.
8. The proposed advertisement introduces a billboard structure, of significantly larger scale than other commercial advertisements in the immediate area, to a historic building. Although the area is heavily characterised by ground floor commercial premises with varied colours and signs, the width, height and siting of the ground level advertisement covers a highly visible and prominent part of no 125. The scale disrupts the cohesive red brick and white stone materiality of the locally listed building, thus diminishing the ability to appreciate its attractive baroque design.
9. In addition, due to its excessive scale and inappropriate siting, the existing advertisement dominates the side elevation of the building and appears unduly prominent within the street scene, further diminishing the historic character of no 125. There is a lack of similar billboards in the area, as advertisements are otherwise largely restricted to shopfronts and bus shelters. Therefore, the sign is also incongruous to commercial signs in close vicinity and harms the amenity of the area.
10. Although existing graffiti is present on the wall of the appeal building, this provides no justification for the introduction of an incongruous and unsympathetic structure to a building with high historic significance. For the reasons given above, the advertisement harms the amenity of the area and has a detrimental effect on the significance of no 125 as a non-designated heritage asset. The appeal scheme therefore conflicts with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021) and Policy BHC1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019 – 2041 (Adopted February 2022), which seek to conserve or enhance the local distinctiveness and significance of heritage assets. I have taken these policies into account insofar as they are material in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR