



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by **S F Barnes MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/25/3374976

Jubilee Place, 6 High Road, Ickenham, Middlesex UB10 8LJ

- 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 Mr Alvin Osei-Tutu of Bluebird Care against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 79593/APP/2025/1961.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of a non-illuminated freestanding sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. No objection was raised by the Council on the grounds of public safety, and I see no compelling reason to take a different view on that matter.
3. At my site visit, the appeal sign was already in position. I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. Having regard to the above, the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity, with particular regard to the effect on the significance of heritage assets.

Reasons

5. The appeal site contains an unlisted mid-terrace building fronting onto the High Road. The building is slightly set back from the footway, unlike its immediate adjoining neighbours. The appeal sign is located at the edge of the High Road footway, above an existing short boundary wall. Limited signage is present on the frontages of adjoining buildings, in a variety of materials.
6. The site is within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area ('the IVCA'), the significance of which, as it relates to this appeal, is drawn from the function of the immediate surroundings as the historic village centre, its fine historic buildings with modest and restrained traditional architecture, landscaping and a village pond. Insofar as it applies to the consideration of amenity, I have had regard to the duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act'), which requires the decision maker to have special regard to the

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

7. A number of statutorily listed buildings have been identified in the surroundings of the site. The statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Act which, amongst other things, requires the decision maker to have special regard to preserving the setting of a Listed Building, only applies to the consideration of whether to grant planning permission. Nonetheless, the fact that a building is listed can be material consideration when considering the effect on amenity.
8. The grade II* listed Church of St Giles (List Entry Number 1080229) occupies a corner plot on the opposite side of the High Road, into which it is recessed, with the building largely screened from the High Road by hedges and established trees.
9. Directly adjoining in this terrace is the grade II listed No.4 High Road (No. 1080228). Its significance derives in part from its prominent position to the centre of the historic village as well as its traditional architecture, which contributes to the High Road streetscene.
10. Opposite the site are the K6 Telephone Kiosk Opposite Swakeleys Road (No. 1080116), and slightly further away, the Pump on Island in Road (No. 1358381). Those are both grade II listed and contribute to the historic significance of the IVCA and the role of this location as a focal point for village life.
11. Surrounding non-designated heritage assets include No.6 High Road, which occupies the appeal site, and the adjacent No.10. These locally listed buildings are 2-storeys terraced buildings of restrained architecture which are sympathetic to listed neighbouring buildings and contribute to an orderly and restrained streetscene.
12. The appeal sign is an aluminium composite panel with applied sticker on metal supporting poles. Given the variety of materials used in signs nearby, I am satisfied that the materials are appropriate to the context. The poles are of a utilitarian appearance but are modest in size and fairly inconspicuous in their context.
13. The sign panel, however, occupies a prominent position within the streetscene. Due to its scale and siting, it obscures a significant part of the front elevation at No.6, including its ground floor windows. This obtrusive appearance detracts from the architectural composition of this non-designated heritage asset and the contribution it makes to streetscene and the significance of the IVCA and the immediate setting of the adjoining No.4 and No.10, resulting in harm to these heritage assets. Whilst I do not doubt that the design and choice of colours benefited from professional input, this does not mitigate the harm that I have identified.
14. As regards the Church of St Giles, the distance and intervening landscape features between the sign and this building mean that the appeal site makes very limited contribution to its significance through its setting, as such the sign causes no harm in this regard. Likewise, the sign has no harmful effect on the significance of the nearby K6 Telephone Kiosk and Pump on Island in Road because their historical and evidential value remains intact.

15. Although I did observe other signs affixed to railings in position at the opposite side of the High Road, signage at a nearby petrol station and at a public house, these signs do not generally obscure significant architectural features of buildings. Moreover, those signs, and other signs referred to concerning a care home elsewhere, are not experienced in the same townscape setting and heritage context as the appeal site. The presence of those signs does not therefore justify the harm I have identified at this site.
16. The appellant considers clear signage in this location to be both necessary and a public benefit. The tests set out at paragraphs 212 to 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which relate to the balancing of heritage harm from development against public benefits, apply to heritage-related consent regimes under the Act¹. These provisions are not therefore directly relevant to my decision. Consequently, the asserted benefits are not determinative. Even if I were to take them into account, I am not satisfied that they cannot be achieved through a less harmful or alternative design.
17. The appellant has offered to make minor adjustments to ensure compliance with the Council's policies. However, I must consider the appeal solely on the plans and evidence before me.
18. I therefore conclude that the advertisement has a harmful effect on amenity, with particular regard to the significance of the IVCA and to the setting of the identified heritage assets. This would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the IVCA, conflicting with the requirements of s72(1) of the Act. Whilst not determinative, there is also conflict with relevant provisions of Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 13A of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) ('LP') insofar as they are material to considering amenity. Those policies, amongst other considerations, seek advertising and signs that provide a high quality contextual design and to protect heritage assets and their settings.
19. Policies D1 and D4 of the LP broadly relate to assessing local capacity for urban growth and maintaining design quality in new development. Although referred to by the Council's notice of decision, I do not find these policies to be directly relevant to the main issue in this appeal.

Conclusion

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

S F Barnes

INSPECTOR

¹ This is set out at footnote 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework.