



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

**Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Z/25/3362969**

**Pavement o/s 321 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow TW5 0DR**

- 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 Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref is P/2024/4061.
  - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display, plus removal of existing telephone kiosks.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Preliminary Matter

3. The Council has drawn my attention to statutory plan policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account where relevant. However, powers under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations), to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any relevant factors. Therefore, in my determination of this appeal, the policies cited by the Council have not, by themselves, been decisive.

### Main Issue

4. The Council has raised no objection in respect of amenity, and there is no evidence before me which would lead me to dispute this conclusion. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The proposed illuminated advertisement display would be located on the footway outside number 321 Vicarage Farm Road which is adjacent to a T-junction and mini roundabout. The proposed advertising display would face west and be positioned directly adjacent to the highway and specifically adjacent to the give way area on the south bound approach to the mini roundabout (the southbound approach). I

noted that in addition to the highway demands, there were dropped kerbs with tactile paving and a pedestrian safety island with tactile paving a small distance back from the give way at this location. There were no road markings to direct pedestrians to look left or look right at this location.

6. The Planning Practice Guidance – Advertisements (PPG) emphasises that all advertisements are intended to attract attention, but proposed advertisements at points where drivers need to take more care are more likely to affect public safety. For example, at junctions, roundabouts, pedestrian crossings, on the approach to a low bridge or level crossing or other places where local conditions present traffic hazards. Paragraph 068 of the PPG outlines that the main types of advertisement which may cause danger to road users are, amongst others, those which, because of their size or siting, would confuse a road-user's view.
7. The east bound approach on Cranford Lane is relatively straight and the advertisement would be visible over a relatively long-range view. A little distance back from the give way and mini roundabout is a pedestrian crossing formed of a dropped curb with tactile and a pedestrian safety island. There are look left and look right markings here to direct pedestrians' attention appropriately. Parking is restricted on the east bound approach by double yellow lines; however, there are three on street parking spaces before this restriction. At the time of my visit two of these parking spaces were occupied.
8. The east bound approach to the mini roundabout requires road users to give way to the right. I noted on my site visit that whilst still in motion, road users would look right upon the approach to the mini roundabout some distance back from the give way and after the parked vehicles. I observed pedestrians using the dropped kerbs and safety island to cross at this location and I observed cyclists joining the roundabout from the south bound approach without looking or stopping.
9. An illuminated advertisement display at the proposed location would be a prominent feature in drivers' field of view on the east bound approach. Furthermore, it would be directly adjacent to road users waiting to join the roundabout from the south bound approach and therefore would compete for the attention of some drivers. It would form a distraction to drivers and draw their attention away from one of their required fields of vision, that being of traffic to the right.
10. Even though the advertisement images would be static, their scale, illuminated digital nature, and changing at regular intervals, would have the potential to attract the prolonged attention of some drivers. Whilst the speed of traffic is low at this location it is noted for its crash data. The additional visual information, resulting in even momentary distraction on the approach to the T-junction mini roundabout, would reduce the time to assess potential risks such as stopping vehicles, merging bicycles, or crossing pedestrians, thereby increasing the risk of a collision in this location where a high degree of concentration is necessary.
11. The effect of the digital display would be exacerbated at times of dark where the illuminated display would stand out and demand attention due to its location directly adjacent to the highway. The appellant draws my attention to other illuminated displays in the vicinity. However, those displays are attached to shopfronts at a distance away from the highway and are not in direct competition for road users' attention next to the highway. Furthermore, they are smaller in size and generally appear to be internally illuminated as opposed to forming a digital screen like the

proposed advertisement. As such I differentiate them from the subject appeal and attribute their existence little weight.

12. Conditions to control the nature of the image transition and industry standard luminance would not sufficiently mitigate for the distracting nature of the display in this particular location.
13. The appellant has specifically referred me to an appeal case in Bristol, reference APP/Z0116/Z/22/3309965. That case concerned digital advertisements at bus stops. The subject appeal site is not a bus stop, it is located on the footway directly adjacent to a roundabout. Therefore, I differentiate that case from the current appeal. Nonetheless, each case must be determined on its own merits.
14. Therefore, the proposed advertising display in this location would have a harmful impact on public safety. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies EC2 and CC5 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), insofar as they seek development that avoids adverse impacts on the transport network and public safety.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*S Wilson*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*A M Nilsson*

INSPECTOR