



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/Z/25/3361164

173 Green Lanes, Southgate, Enfield N13 4UR

- 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 Mr Gary Cockerill on behalf of Alight Media against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/04043/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is new single illuminated 48-sheet digital advertisement display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue(s)

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a mixed-use area. The advertisement the subject of this appeal would be located 3.9m above ground level centrally on blank wall facing a busy signalised junction of the A406, North Circular Road with Green Lanes. It is a multi-laned, highly trafficked street-lit road with a variety of commercial occupiers on approach to and within the immediate area of the appeal site.
4. The advertisement would be 6m in width and 3m in height with a relatively slimline design. The static digital images displayed would change every 10 seconds. Due to the location and scale of the proposed advert the illumination and changing static images would be obvious in the streetscene.
5. In assessing amenity I have taking into account the advertisements within the area. Advertisements in the area in predominantly comprised of commercial signage on a ground floor unit fascia's of a property, other types of advertisement were also observed in the area during my site visit.
6. The advertisement before me is on a prominent corner site and would be dominant on this busy junction and in the streetscene. Whilst there are a significant number of adverts in the area, the advertisement would be at odds with the general characteristics of the area due to the scale, location and illuminated changing images. The advertisements would add visual clutter and detract from the amenity of the area.

7. I conclude that the display of the advertisement proposed would be detrimental to the amenity of the area.
8. I have taken into account Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) (the Core Strategy), Policies DMD37 and DMD41 of the Improving Enfield, Development Management Document (DMD) (2014) and Policy D8 of the London Plan (2021) which seeks to protect amenity and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with this policy.
9. Similarly, there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements.
10. In the reason for refusal the Council contend that the proposal would conflict with the CP31 of the Core Strategy and the London Borough of Enfield Shopfronts and Associated Advertisements, Supplementary Planning Guidance (the SPG), I disagree. Policy CP31 relates to developments affecting heritage assets, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to confirm that heritage assets would be affected. The SPG relates to shopfronts and associated advertisements it does not relate to the type of advertisement the subject of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed, and express consent is refused for the new single illuminated 48-sheet digital advertisement display.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR