



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/25/3362932

Pavement o/s 116 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, London W4 1PU

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by NWP Street Limited against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is P/2024/3785.
 - The proposal is the installation of an internally illuminated advertising display panel to a communication kiosk.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Council refers to development plan policy. The Regulations require that decisions be made only in interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore, development plan policy alone cannot be decisive, but I have taken it into account as a material consideration. I would agree with the Council that there is no public safety issue in this instance.
 4. The site is towards the outer edge of a wide footway which fronts an attractive terraced 3 storey building, with No 116 being one of the commercial premises on the ground floor and flats above. The highway is part of the main commercial street, Chiswick High Road, which is a busy tree-lined thoroughfare used by private vehicles, buses, cyclists with a large volume of pedestrians on the wide footways. These pavements include varying street furniture, services, bus stops, telephone kiosks and some advertisements along with the generally large and dominant trees. The character is one of established mixed use and the appearance and ambience is attractive and locally distinctive.
 5. The site is within the Chiswick High Road Conservation Area.
 6. The proposal would be on a new approved communications kiosk and would be an advertisement panel described on the application forms as being 1.635m (h), 0.925m (w), 0.35m (d), set 0.37m above ground level, in a
-

powder coated steel frame with LCD panel recessed behind laminated safety glass. The advertisements would be illuminated internally with static illumination at maximum illuminance levels of 3500 cd/m. The static advertising images would change every 10 seconds.

Amenity

7. In general terms, even with extensive and continuous business premises and a busy main road, signage and advertisement displays, struck me as quite low key in nature. Usually, the advertising is directly related and scaled to premises and, overall, there is an aesthetic which is far from brash or impactful. Trees generally dominate and the atmosphere is one of busyness but with some visual restraint and apparent tradition.
8. The stretch on the north side of Chiswick High Road, between Thornton Avenue and Upham Park Road, which would contain the advertisement display, does not have any illuminated advertising on the footway. There are functional items such as a post-box, cycle racks, location map, lamp standards and a telephone kiosk but these all visually read as ancillary and background to the main scene. They do not jar on the eye. Recent tree planting has taken place, presumably to further enhance the scene and natural environment. This is an attractive and relatively traditional stretch of businesses, flats and pedestrian passage which is also proximate to key views and buildings of identified quality.
9. Against the area's local character, I would not support what would appear a less than low-key format in this prominent position. Even with restricted and variable luminance and limited light spread and the technical case put forward by the Appellant, it would undoubtedly be an eye-catching changing display to people within the area generally, during the day and, other than between midnight and 5am, in hours of darkness. The visual qualities of the area would diminish with an incongruous and obtrusive display feature which would be relatively bold, sizeable and forwardly positioned well detached from commercial premises and would simply not be suited in these environs. Neither the character or appearance of the Conservation Area could be said to be preserved in my opinion.
10. In summary, the scheme would result in an unacceptable negative impact on amenity

Other matters

11. I have considered both the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance advice on advertisements and the factors embodied in these documents on matters such as economic and business encouragement. However, the Framework explains that control in the interest of amenity is valid where there would be appreciable impacts such as I have described.
12. Illuminated displays elsewhere and on, for example, local bus stops are cited by the Appellant but these by reason of siting or form are different propositions from the appeal proposal to my mind. Indeed, some should not, in my opinion, set a benchmark for appropriate illuminated

advertisements along this thoroughfare. In any event I must determine this case on its own merits.

13. I appreciate that illumination levels on the system are controlled automatically. I recognise that planning conditions could reinforce this were I minded to allow the appeal; but I find the proposed illumination simply inappropriate for this location in aesthetic terms. I acknowledge there are positive points applicable over sustainability in all its senses with the signage and that remote operation would reduce travel. The arrangements could be used for community announcements or public information. I can see that the planned new communication kiosk with its equipment would be preferable over the old style but if the implication is that the illuminated advertisements are required to bring it forward in this location then I am not persuaded on over-arching merits of the change. These foregoing matters have some individual and cumulative benefit and I give them limited weight.

14. I have carefully considered these and all the other points raised by the Appellant. However, these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in respect of the main issue identified above.

Overall conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would be unduly detrimental to amenity. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR