

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2025

by **K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/Z/24/3350040**

**Verge prior to White Hart Roundabout, Church Road, Ealing UB5 5AX**

- 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 J Woodward Marketing Force Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref is 24/1979/ADV.
  - The advertisement proposed is a free-standing, non-illuminated fascia advertisement.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require decisions to be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Factors relevant to amenity are stated by the Regulations to include the general characteristics of the locality, including features of historic or architectural interest.
3. Since the appeal was submitted, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. This has not raised any new matters which are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

5. The appeal site is a prominent location which lies next to a grass verge adjacent to Church Road on the immediate approach to the busy multi-limbed White Hart Roundabout. The application is for a freestanding a non-illuminated fascia advertisement facing the lanes approaching the roundabout.
6. The area has a mixed character with residential scale development and commercial elements on exits from the roundabout. However, despite the scale and complex nature of the roundabout it has a verdant character with numerous trees and landscape features within its centre and along the surrounding limbs. This encloses the surrounding roads and as such the area does not appear heavily dominated by road infrastructure, advertisements or commercial buildings. Although this is an inherently urban environment, the grass verge adjacent to the roundabout positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appeal site is not within a conservation area and would not be within the setting of the Grade II listed White Hart Pub (listing 1189457), whose significance is derived from its age and architectural character but is some distance from the appeal site due to the dual carriageway. Whilst there are small advertisements on the roundabout, illuminated signage on the western side of Church Road and commercial totem signs in the area, the open grass verge in front of the pedestrian walkway are markedly different in character despite road infrastructure. With a verdant landscaped, generous grass verges and a residential pedestrian backdrop results in a more intimate and low key area, and the proposed sign would be conspicuous here.
8. Due to its size and position the sign would also be very prominent to motorists, and pedestrians when approaching the roundabout from the north east along Church Road. Its height above the footway would be imposing and dominating, particularly for pedestrians passing by. Thus, the presence of the appeal proposal here would be incongruously out of character as it would be viewed against a backdrop of trees which form a substantial and pleasant landscaping buffer between the roundabout and views of development beyond on Ruislip Road. I am not of the view that the proposal is sufficiently small in scale that it would not harmfully add to clutter and detract from the visual amenity of the area.
9. In accordance with the regulations and insofar as they are material to the decision, the proposal would be contrary Policies 7.4 and 2.18 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and Policies G4 and D4 of the London Plan, March 2021. Together these seek to ensure that all development is of high quality and responds positively to its context and does not compromise openness. It would also conflict with the amenity aims set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance set out in the PPG which seeks to ensure good design and protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements. For similar reasons, the proposal would also not accord with Policies DAA and variation of London Plan Policy G4 of the Draft Ealing Local Plan.

### **Other Matters**

10. The reason for refusal relates to amenity only and the Council raises no concerns regarding public safety. There is no reason for me to come to a different view on public safety. However, this does not outweigh the harm to amenity.
11. There would be some small economic benefits arising from the proposal. Whilst previous appeals have been allowed in the vicinity of the site, they are in a differing location. I also note that the illuminated advert was to replace an existing hoarding, and that the issue of amenity was not a determinative factor in that appeal. These elements are not sufficient to alter my opinion on this proposal.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. Thus, the appeal is dismissed.

*K Williams*

INSPECTOR