



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/25/3370161

56-58 Goodmayes Road, Ilford IG3 9UR

- 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 Goodmayes Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1461/25.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of 2no non-illuminated poster-style advertisement.
-

Decisions

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application and appeal forms describe the proposal as “1no non-illuminated poster-style advertisement”. The application drawings show a pair of poster-style advertisements close together and the appellant’s grounds of appeal makes it clear that the proposal comprises 2 advertisements. To avoid potential misunderstanding I have amended the description of development to reflect this fact.
3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered 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. The advertisements described in the banner heading above were in place at the time of my site visit.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises hoardings situated between 56-58 Goodmayes Road and the bridge over the neighbouring railway cutting. The former forms part of a parade of single-storey retail units situated within the Goodmayes Local Centre and close to the station. The hoardings are relatively tall elements in the context of the

- single storey parade and the bridge, although the wider area includes more substantial buildings.
7. The appeal scheme comprises the installation of a pair of matching non-illuminated advertisements measuring about 2.4m tall by 2.4m wide and installed about 1.5m above ground level. Consent is being sought for a temporary period of 5 years.
 8. I note that there have been advertisements at the appeal site for many years. There is however no evidence before me to indicate that these benefited from consent and the photographs provided show advertisement at a lower level than currently proposed.
 9. The advertisements that are the subject of this appeal are situated on the edge of a commercial area and are partly viewed in the context of the neighbouring retail parade. However, due to their height and close vicinity to the bridge and trees beyond they form an overly prominent and garish addition to the street scene. As such they have an unacceptable effect on the visual amenity of the area.
 10. I have taken into account the policies cited by the Council in its reason for refusal which are material to this case. Given my conclusions above, it follows that the proposal conflicts with these policies.
 11. Reference has been made to the recently consented advertisement on the blank flank wall of 88-90 Goodmayes Road, a short distance from the appeal site. As each application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, having regard to its particular setting and context, I attribute limited weight to this.
 12. The appellant has advised that the advertisements are intended to be temporary because the site is earmarked for redevelopment. There is no evidence before me to indicate that this is likely to occur in the next few years or that the redevelopment scheme would include the removal of the hoarding to which the advertisements are attached. I therefore attribute limited weight to this potential scenario.
 13. As I am required to assess the proposal before me, the various alternative options put forward by the appellant have not been considered.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR