



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2025

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/Z/25/3362341

2 Trinity Street, Enfield, London EN2 6NS

- 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 Saadat Farziyeva against the decision of The London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03915/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of an internally illuminated fascia sign at 2 Trinity Street, Enfield, London EN2 6NS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03915/ADV, dated 20 November 2024. 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.

Procedural Matters

2. This appeal relates to the display of an advertisement that has already commenced. As the application is therefore retrospective, I have considered the submission accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) sets out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.
4. From the material submitted for the purposes of this appeal the main issues relate to amenity, specifically the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal building and that of the local area; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal building sits towards the junction of Trinity Street with Chase Side, a street predominantly fronted in this part by retail and commercial premises. This end of Trinity Street is also predominantly fronted by buildings with a retail or commercial use and character, including the appeal building. The appeal building is adjacent to a primary school with terraced houses opposite. The rest of the street is also predominantly residential in character.
6. The internally illuminated fascia sign to which this appeal relates is approximately 1 metre high and 5.8 meters wide and is located on the front of the appeal building, between the ground floor of the premises to which the sign relates and a first floor flat. The sign is backlit with the letters and logo showing illumination, with the majority of the sign being in black opaque vinyl. The planning application form states that the illumination level is 300cd/m² and is confirmed by the appellant in their statement.
7. From my site visit it was evident that the internally illuminated sign is proportionate to the size of the appeal building, reflecting the signage in the immediate local area. This reflects the character of the appeal building and the retail/commercial character of this end of the street and it does not therefore appear to be a dominating feature to either the appeal building or the local area. Further, given the limited extent of the illumination of the lettering and logos on the sign it does not appear to be visually intrusive, but rather to reflect the use of the building to which it relates and to conform to and reflect the character and appearance of the local area. In these regards, the appeal sign conforms to the guidance set out in the Enfield Shopfronts and Associated Advertisements Supplementary Planning Guidance

Living Conditions

8. The Council's reason for refusal state that insufficient information was proved with the planning application relating to illumination and the potential for exposure of neighbouring residents to light pollution. However, as I identify above, the application form states the light level of output from the LED light source and the submitted drawings show backlighting to the lettering and logos only, with the light source otherwise contained within an aluminium box.
9. From my site visit it was evident that advertisement as installed on the appeal building conforms to this submitted material and I find that the details given show that the sign has a limited level of illumination with no overspill that results in exposure to neighbouring residents of intrusive light pollution. As such, I find that it results in no significant detriment to their living conditions and residential amenity.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the internally illuminated fascia sign does not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building or the local area, or to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and does not therefore result in any detrimental effect on amenity. It therefore accords with Policies DMD37 and DMD41 of the Enfield Development management Document (2014), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), policy D8 of the London Plan and Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). Collectively these seek advertisements that are in keeping with the

character of their host building and location, and are not detrimental to residential amenity, including through light spillage.

Conditions

11. I have not thought it necessary to attach any further conditions in addition to the standard conditions set out in schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

V Callister

INSPECTOR