



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/24/3352126

Advertising Right 2934, 9 Park Road, Hornsey, Haringey, London N8 8TE

- 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 London Lites Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/1361.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement of a previous lightbox advertisement display with a LED digital advertisement display at a reduced height from ground level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered in terms of amenity and public safety. The Regulations state that factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including features of historic interest. The appeal site falls within the Crouch End Conservation Area (CECA) and the statutory duty under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 applies, insofar as it relates to the consideration of amenity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity, with particular reference to the CECA.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a flank wall of a building in a parade of shops and is located within the CECA. From my observations, the significance of the CECA, in so far as it is relevant to this appeal, is primarily derived from its high-quality townscape and aesthetic value resulting from the mix of building styles. The current weathered and untidy appearance of the flank wall at the appeal site makes a neutral contribution to the CECA.
5. Although the area has a commercial character, there are limited modestly sized advertisements along Park Road in the form of projecting and shop fascia signs which are largely closely associated with the business units to which they are displayed upon. In contrast, the proposed digital advertisement display would be of

a much larger scale at both ground floor and first floor level and out of keeping with the existing advertisements along the shopping parade.

6. The proposal's position and size would not relate positively to the surrounding shopfronts and fenestration. In addition, in oblique views from the opposite side of Park Road on approach to the site the proposal would detract from the architectural interest of the main elevational treatment of 9 Park Road. Overall, the proposal's visual effects would be unsympathetic to, and discordant with, the high-quality townscape of the CECA. This would be harmful to the amenity of the area, detracting from the historic environment. As such, neither the character nor the appearance of the CECA would be preserved.
7. The appeal site has a long history of advertising and reference is made to the proposal replacing a previous illuminated lightbox advertisement of the same size. However, this advertisement has been removed and so does not form part of the site's existing context. In any event, while the proposal would be more slimline than the previous advertisement, and its siting would have a better relationship with the flank wall and wouldn't compete with the eaves, in being lower down the proposal's scale would be dominant and obtrusive at street level.
8. Despite the lighting established in the area, and even though the technology deployed would result in a lower luminance than the previous advertisement and be within recommended levels, given its size, siting and its illuminated nature, the proposed advertisement would be a strident feature within the street scene. Further control of luminance and the frequency of images could be secured through planning conditions. However, this would not adequately resolve the visual effects of the proposal.
9. Digital advertisements are a familiar feature in London, and it is indicated that there are similar advertisements to the proposal in the wider area. Nevertheless, within the context of generally modestly sized advertisements the proposal would appear as an incongruously large and highly visible illuminated digital advertisement that would visually dominate the area. While the appeal site's current impression is not particularly visually appealing, it is not as inharmonious with the prevailing character and appearance as the appeal scheme would be.
10. To conclude on this main issue, the display of the advertisement would unacceptably harm the amenity of the area, failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CECA. I have taken into account Policies D8 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM3, DM8 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017) which seek to protect amenity, including the conservation of the historic environment and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal would conflict with these policies.

Other Matters

11. The appellant indicates there would be environmental and economic benefits arising from the proposal, including energy efficiency and stimulating consumer demand. However, matters not relating to amenity and public safety fall outside the scope of this appeal, as defined in the Regulations. As such, these potential benefits do not provide justification for allowing the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR