
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/25/3376801

49 Bruce Grove, Tottenham, London N17 6RN

- 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 Alder King Planning Consultants against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/2546.
 - The advertisement proposed is a 48-sheet billboard advertising display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Advertisement Regulations stipulate that control may only be exercised in the interests of 'amenity' and 'public safety', taking account of any material factors. Considerations of amenity include the general characteristics of the locality and the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest, which encompasses listed buildings and conservation areas.
3. The development plan policies and guidance referred to by the parties are not determinative, but I have taken these into account insofar as they are material to the assessment of matters under consideration.
4. The Council did not object on public safety grounds, and I have no reason to disagree. Accordingly, my assessment is limited to amenity considerations.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity, with due regard to the Bruce Castle and All Hallows Conservation Area (CA) and nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises the flank elevation of 49 Bruce Grove, a two-storey, end-of-terrace property within the CA. It also sits opposite the Grade II listed Drapers' Almshouses and Chapel.
7. The CA derives some of its special interest and significance from its rich historic environment, including important views, mature landscaping, and groupings of listed and locally listed buildings that collectively contribute to a coherent townscape character.

8. The Grade II listed Drapers' Almshouses form a mid-nineteenth-century group of architecturally distinctive yellow-brick almshouses arranged around a broad landscaped courtyard, with a central Gothic chapel. Their coherent composition, historic social function and strong collective presence make a highly notable contribution to the character of this part of Bruce Grove and the CA as a whole.
9. The flank elevation of No 49 is highly visible from Bruce Grove and Linley Road. Although blank, the wall contributes to the simple and coherent architectural form of the locally listed terrace. The Bruce Castle and All Hallows Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2019) identifies that surviving early-to-mid 19-century terraced houses, such as those forming this group, contribute a quiet and modest domestic character to the area.
10. The proposed billboard would be mounted in an elevated position across a large proportion of the flank elevation. Its size, prominent siting and overtly commercial appearance would contrast sharply with the modest architecture, materials and domestic character of the host building. Although the format would be non-illuminated and of a traditional paste-and-paper type, its physical presence would nevertheless interrupt the plain brick elevation and appear visually intrusive, thereby diminishing the architectural simplicity of the building and the contribution it makes to the significance of the CA.
11. The billboard would not directly face the Drapers' Almshouses, which are mostly set back from the road and partially screened by roadside vegetation. These factors reduce the degree to which the advertisement would be experienced in conjunction with the listed buildings. I therefore accept that its effect would be less pronounced than if the billboard directly faced Bruce Grove or contained digital illumination.
12. However, despite this mitigation, the proposal would still introduce a visually assertive commercial feature within the wider setting of the Almshouses and Chapel. The flank wall forms part of the progression of views along Bruce Grove towards the listed group. The roadside vegetation does not fully screen these views when travelling northwards, where glimpsed and framed views of the Almshouses are an important aspect of their appreciation. In such views, the billboard's size and graphic content would attract the eye and draw attention away from the architectural quality and calm landscaped setting of the listed buildings. As a result, it would harmfully erode the ability to appreciate the significance of the listed group and would not preserve their setting.
13. The appellant refers to the former presence of a billboard at the site. However, that advertisement has been removed, and so the existing blank wall forms the correct baseline for assessment. Little weight can be attached to the historic presence of the previous display.
14. Although other advertisements exist further along Bruce Grove, they are located within a commercial context and are not experienced in the same townscape setting as the appeal site. Their presence does not justify the site-specific harm that would arise here.
15. Similarly, while other large-format advertisements, including digital screens, may have been accepted in different conservation areas or near listed buildings, this is not justification for the harm that would result in this location.

16. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would be detrimental in visual amenity terms. Whilst not decisive, there is conflict with Policy DM3 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017 (DPD), which requires advertisements to be sensitive to the host building and street scene, especially in relation to conservation areas and listed buildings. There is also conflict with the general design and historic environment protection objectives of Policy DM9 of the DPD, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 (SP), and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (LP).
17. Although also cited by the Council, I do not find Policies SP10 of the SP, or D4 and D8 of the LP, directly relevant to the advertisement considerations in this appeal.

Other Matters

18. While the appellant highlights potential economic benefits, these are not material to the determination of advertisement consent, which must be assessed solely on amenity and public safety grounds. As such, they do not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I find that the advertisement would cause significant harm to amenity. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR