



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/Z/25/3369934

546a Romford Road, Manor Park, Newham E13 0SJ

- 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 25/00767/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is upgrade of 1no. existing 48-sheet paper and paste advertising display with 1no. smaller D250 digital advertising display (D-Poster).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for replacement of 1no. existing 48-sheet paper and paste advertising display with 1no. smaller D250 digital advertising display (D-Poster) as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:-
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the sign permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 300cd/m² in the hours of darkness. During the daylight hours the luminance shall be controlled by sensors and/or timers to reflect ambient light conditions. At all times the display shall operate within that recommended by the Institution of Lighting Professionals in its Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (or its equivalent in a replacement guide).
 - 2) No individual advertisement displayed shall at any time contain moving images, animation, intermittent or full motion video images, audio, directional symbols or any images that resemble road signs, traffic signals or traffic matrix signs.
 - 3) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be no less than 10 seconds.
 - 4) The interval between successive advertisements shall be no greater than 1 second and the complete display shall change without effect.
 - 5) The advertisement display shall at all times contain a feature that will turn the display off (showing a black/blank screen) in the event of malfunction or error, or if the advertisement is not in use.

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 Matters

3. The application form describes the proposal as an upgrade of the existing sign, but the term 'replacement' is used in the Council's decision notice and throughout the appellant's statement. The word 'replacement' more accurately reflects the proposal, and provides greater certainty, so I have used it in the decision above.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance all clarify that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Neither the Council nor any other party has raised any objection to the proposed advertisement from a public safety perspective, and I am satisfied that the display could be appropriately controlled to prevent distraction to drivers and other road users.
5. The reason for refusal cites Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the Newham Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan), Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021 and the Framework. Given the requirements of the Regulations, I have taken these policies into account where relevant, but they have not been decisive in my consideration of this appeal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement upon amenity.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal proposal is for a portrait orientated illuminated digital display board mounted onto a hoarding, which would replace a landscape non-illuminated traditional paper and paste display which has been in situ for an extensive period. As with the current advertisement, the proposal, sited beside Woodgrange Park rail station in a mixed-use neighbourhood, would face Romford Road's westbound traffic. Whereas the existing 48-sheet display is attached to the front corner of an adjacent two storey terrace with a resulting awkward curved profile, the proposal would stand separate from this building, upon part of the current installation's footprint.
8. I observed this part of Romford Road to be a well-lit urban streetscape with a steady flow of traffic and movement. The surrounding built form is predominantly two storey terrace blocks, comprising a mix of commercial uses at ground level with residential accommodation above, together with a range of typical street furniture and highway signage. Illuminated ground floor fascia signs associated with their host property are widespread, whilst taller installations are also present nearby; notably a projecting sign affixed to a prominent gable and a free-standing totem at a nearby petrol filling station. The appeal site is therefore seen in the context of an illuminated commercial streetscene featuring a range of advertisements, whilst simultaneously viewed as a subordinate structure against the larger scale of its adjacent terrace and more dominant presence of a mid-rise apartment building in its backdrop.

9. The proposed separation from the adjacent terrace would result in a standalone siting that is frequently associated with digital advertisements of this nature. In contrast with the ungainly appearance of the existing installation, the proposal's simpler detached form and reduced overall size would sit more comfortably within a streetscene populated by a range of freestanding structures, including an immediately adjacent bus shelter. On this basis, its resulting appearance and placement would not be awkward or incongruous to the character of the locality, notwithstanding its digitised imagery and increased height.
10. The proposed replacement display would continue to be viewed in the same context as the larger existing installation and consequently would not increase visual clutter. Although the proposal would rise slightly above the eaves line of the neighbouring building, this modest increase in height would be offset by the considerable reduction in its width, such that its resulting proportions and appearance would not be unduly overbearing or dominant in the locality. The proposal would remain subservient in scale to the surrounding built environment against which it would be viewed, whilst the existence of signage of similar or greater height nearby would furthermore reinforce its appropriateness.
11. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that the replacement display would appear as an incongruous or intrusive feature within the streetscene and therefore find that the proposal would have an acceptable effect upon amenity.
12. Local Plan Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 and London Plan Policies D4 and D8 are referred to on the decision notice and, amongst other things, set out the Council's approach to securing high quality development that reinforces local distinctiveness and integrates with the streetscene, including the pursuit of a well-designed public realm with carefully considered lighting. I have had regard to these policies where they are material, but they were not determinative in my assessment of amenity.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a series of additional conditions beyond the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations. These are comparable to the 'model conditions' set out within PLG 05. I agree that conditions relating to the intensity and brightness of illumination and the means by which to control it; the types of images that should not be displayed, the refresh rate and the method of transition for images are necessary and reasonable in the interests of amenity and public safety. I have therefore imposed conditions to that effect.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity and therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Morrison

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 allowed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR