



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/Z/24/3357935

Slip Road Verge off A406, Adjacent to Beckton Roundabout, towards A13, Barking, IG11 7SD

- 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 Marketing Force Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application ref. is 24/02016/ADV.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 1 no. free-standing, non-illuminated fascia advertisement board and non-reflective signage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have amended the address of the proposal on the application form to reflect its location closer to Barking than Dagenham.
3. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance confirm this approach.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area and public safety.

Reasons

Amenity

5. The location is one of road infrastructure framed by verge or embankment trees and shrubs with occasional glimpses of commercial buildings in the distance. One or two roadside advertisement boards of similar scale can be found in the vicinity. As such, it is not a particularly sensitive environment.
6. The proposed advertisement board is limited in scale and would be seen in the context of the verge and its soft landscape, rather than obscuring or dominating either. I do not consider, therefore, that it or its cumulative effect alongside other advertisements would harm the amenity of the area.

7. In this respect, the proposal complies with Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (GLA, March 2021), and Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the Newham Local Plan (December 2018), which require the public realm to be attractive having regard to contextual analysis of the characteristics of the area.

Public safety

8. I note the objection by the Council's Transportation Team, in whose opinion the sign would distract drivers. A similar sign on the approach to the roundabout, referred to by the appellant, did not appear to change driver behaviour during my site visit, but is in the central reservation and is sighted some way away.
9. Research referred to by the appellant reports that changing signs represent a greater distraction to drivers than static ones, the latter not affecting situational awareness. This has been attributed to movement capturing drivers' attention; however, little insight is offered as to relative distraction time.
10. I do note from the report, however, that the road traffic environment plays a role, that it is a consistent finding in the literature that roadside advertising seems to be correlated with road crashes and that some authors advise that commercial signs should be completely avoided at intersections (or nearby).
11. As the proposal is on the inside of a curve with poorer sighting due to roadside trees and shrubs than the sign on the central reservation, I cannot be sure that it will not distract drivers, who will be executing a turn at the point at which they encounter the sign with limited chance to assimilate its information. It therefore has significant potential to cause distraction to drivers of moving vehicles.
12. In this respect, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (GLA, March 2021), and Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the Newham Local Plan (December 2018), which require the public realm to be safe and proposals to promote public safety.

Conclusion

13. The proposed advertisement would not harm visual amenity but would harm public safety. I conclude, therefore, that advertisement consent should be refused.

S Simms

INSPECTOR