



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/24/3356839

575 Lordship Lane, Wood Green, Haringey, London N22 5LE

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application ref is HGY/2024/1599.
- The advertisement proposed is described as: Erection of a D6 small format Advertising Display.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the erection of a D6 small format Advertising Display at 575 Lordship Lane, Wood Green, Haringey, London N22 5LE in accordance with the terms of the application, ref HGY/2024/1599. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The maximum level of luminance shall be no more than 300 cd/m² during hours of darkness (dusk until dawn). In daylight hours, the level of luminance shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) ‘Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays’ (or its equivalent in a replacement guide). The level of luminance of the advertisement display shall be controlled by light sensors that measure ambient light levels and automatically control the perceived brightness to within the limits set by this condition.
 - 2) The advertisement display shall not change more frequently than every 10 seconds. The interval between successive displays shall be instantaneous (0.1 seconds or less).
 - 3) The screen display shall only show two dimensional static images, shall contain no moving images, animation, video or full motion images and the display will default to a plain, black screen if there is a malfunction, or the advertisement is not in use.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant included a Highway Safety Report with their appeal documents. This comprised additional evidence which the Council were offered the opportunity to comment on.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

- the amenity of the area; and
- public safety.

Reasons

Amenity

4. The appeal site is located within a petrol filling station. There is a variety of signage on the forecourt including a large, double sided totem advertisement, appearing a dominant feature within the street scene. Opposite the site is a bus stop with two internally illuminated advertisements. Within the visual context of the appeal site the surrounding area is characterised primarily by a mix of residential and commercial uses and green spaces. The commercial uses include quite a variety of signage and advertisements of different scales, forms and illumination levels. This includes some notable runs and assemblages in places, which form part of the established character and appearance of the area. This includes the wider forecourt subject of this appeal advertisement.
5. The proposal would comprise a single-sided freestanding LCD digital advertising display adjoining the highway. The proposal would be viewed within the context of, but set away from, the collection of advertisements within the existing forecourt, many of which are much larger and more visually prominent from many locations. The proposal is of a relatively modest size, similar to that of the advertisements on the opposite side of the highway and thus reflective of existing advertisements within the area.
6. Illumination levels could be controlled to appropriate levels by condition of any consent granted. Its positioning would limit its wider visibility, to that in an easterly direction. As such, the proposal would represent a limited addition to the existing collection of advertisements, would neither appear dominant or result in clutter, in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the amenity of the area. In so far as they are of relevance to the proposal, it would accord with the relevant provisions of Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2017) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) (DMDPD). When read together these policies require advertisements to be sensitive to the surrounding street scene and respect local context.

Public Safety

8. The proposed advertisement would be positioned so as to be visible to those travelling west along the highway with the western elevation blank. As well as the entrance and exit to the forecourt, the proposal is close to a pedestrian crossing and junction, which are currently viewed within the context of a number of advertisements. Whilst my site visit represents a snapshot in time, traffic levels appeared moderate with vehicular speeds limited to 30mph.

9. Given its limited size, quite discrete positioning and the context in which it would be viewed by approaching highway users, there would appear to be limited scope for the advertisement to cause a distraction. Conditions can be imposed to ensure images are static, changing once every 10 seconds, and illumination levels are appropriate, in accordance with good practice guidance¹. I note the Council's concern regarding video advertisements, nevertheless the imposition of conditions would prohibit the use of these.
10. There would be an approximate 50 metres visibility envelope from where drivers would first see the proposal with the pedestrian crossing around 15 metres beyond. This is above the 43 metre Stopping Sight Distance for such circumstances, providing good visibility and reaction time for motorists. Whilst I acknowledge the 18 reported collisions within the Highway Safety Report, a small number of these occurred at a location where the proposed advert would have been visible. Further, there is no evidence before me to suggest that the existing advertisements at the site contributed to any of these collisions.
11. For westbound drivers entering the forecourt, the advertisement would be set back, in a discrete location and viewed with the context of the existing more prominent forecourt signage, limiting its effect on these motorists. Further, the proposal would be setback behind the footway, behind the driver position at the forecourt junction. It would therefore not obstruct driver sightlines when exiting the forecourt onto Lordship Lane.
12. Based on the above, the level of increased risk caused by the proposed advertisement would be very minor and overall, it would not result in an unacceptable effect upon or risk to public safety, alone or cumulatively. Insofar as they are relevant, the proposal would accord with the relevant provisions of Policy DM3 of the DMDPD which requires advertisements to not cause a hazard to pedestrians or road users.

Conditions

13. Whilst the Council is satisfied that no other conditions beyond the 5 standard conditions are required, the appellant has suggested further conditions and I have considered these.
14. In addition to the standard conditions, condition 1 relating to luminance levels is required to ensure that the sign is not overly bright for users of the highway and the amenity of the area. Conditions 2 and 3, controlling the content and movement within the display are necessary in the interest of highway safety.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR

¹ The Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Technical Note 5: Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (2015).