



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/Z/25/3368008

Land adjacent to 100 Jenkins Lane, East Ham, Newham, London IG11 7ZL

- 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 Newham.
 - The application ref is 25/00216/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of new double-sided display with digital advertisements.
-

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 Policies D4, D8 and G6 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies SP3, SP5, SP8, INF6 and SC4 of the Newham Local Plan (2018) (LP), all of which seek in various ways to protect amenity and public safety. Whilst this reflects the power to control advertisements as far as the above-mentioned regulations are concerned, development plan policies are not decisive. I have nonetheless taken their aims into account as material considerations.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement on a) public safety; and b) amenity.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Public Safety

5. The appeal site is directly adjacent the elevated eastbound carriageway of the A13, outside the premises of a secure self-storage business. The road is an arterial dual carriageway, carrying an almost constant stream of traffic. The speed limit is 50 miles per hour. The North Circular slip road is a short distance west of the appeal site, which links onto another spur outside the Travelodge hotel, roughly at the point where it joins the A13 and passes a bus stop.

6. The size and height of the advertisement, and specifically its exposure to the eastbound carriageway, would make it highly prominent and attract attention at a point where drivers of all types of vehicles are either approaching two slip roads or navigating them to join the A13. This is a particularly sensitive section of carriageway where a greater level of attention and concentration on vehicles entering the flow of traffic will be necessary. Especially buses which tend to move slower when joining, particularly from the nearby bus stop.
7. I appreciate that one could control the nature of the change of displays and a number of other measures such as luminescence and types of adverts, but this would not make up for the size and position of the proposal and how it would, for the above reasons, have the capability to unacceptably distract drivers at a point where maximum attention is required. The evidence points to some CrashMap data that indicates there has been a number of collisions along the A13 in its current state. For these reasons, there is a greater likelihood of the installation exacerbating that problem.
8. Whilst double sided, users of the westbound carriageway would not be as detrimentally affected. Distance would be a factor which would go some way to mitigating the immediacy of the display's obviousness and the carriageway at this point approaches a slip road taking vehicles off the A13 rather than joining it. I note the Council's concerns about the designated cycle route on the westbound side, but this is segregated from the vehicular carriageway and thus users are not amongst traffic.
9. The appeal scheme would nonetheless, for the above reasons, fail an assessment against the above-mentioned regulations in terms of public safety. Accordingly, it would not reflect the aims of Policy T4 of the London Plan or Policies INF2 and SP8 of the LP. These seek, amongst other things, to maintain the safety of the public realm and manage any increase of road danger.

Amenity

10. There is some planting around the edges of the A13 close to the storage facility, but it is far from defining what is an area otherwise heavily influenced by a hard commercial feel and dominated by infrastructure. Some green space is below the carriageway to the sides, but this is more pocketed and distinct, at least from visuals along the A13 eastbound and the immediate area around the appeal site. Due to the limited land take of the proposals and its separation from such areas, I do not see there would be an adverse effect on such spaces.
11. The commercial and industrial nature of the immediate and wider area is the defining characteristic of views, and the proposed advertisement would partially block what are already extremely limited views of the surrounding trees and shrubbery. I accept the appellant's contention that the proposed advertisement would be the only one along this particular stretch of road and agree that this proposal would not represent visual clutter on account of the lack of similar advertisements in the vicinity. Similarly, the illumination levels would be appropriate in this location given the commercial character of the area.
12. As such, the advertisement would not harm the amenity of the area and thus, in regard to this main issue, would be acceptable under the regulations. It would, consequently, sit squarely with the aims of Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan

and Policies SP3, SP5 and SP8 of the LP which seek to ensure the public realm consists of high quality design and integrates advertisements with the street scene.

Other Matter

13. The Council has expressed substantive concerns over the ecological effects of the proposal. Whilst amenity can include visual and aural, it does not extend to ecological under the regulations. I have not therefore considered the matter further.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Whilst I have found for the appellant on the second main issue, this would be a neutral matter and incapable of outweighing the harm I have found in regard to the first. It is for this reason that, overall, the appeal scheme would be unacceptable under the regulations and, as such, I recommend the appeal is dismissed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR