



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2026

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/25/3372853

Pavement o/s 156-160 High Road, Ilford IG1 1LL

- 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 Stephen Herraghty of JCDecaux UK Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application reference is 2777/24.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'installation of an internally illuminated freestanding double-sided digital advertisement unit - advertised space measuring 1065mm x 1895mm.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirm that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Regard does not need to be had to the development plan. I have taken relevant policies into account as a material consideration; however, they have not, by themselves, been determinative for this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

4. 'Amenity' as defined in the PPG, is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement. The PPG advises that the local characteristics of an area are relevant when assessing amenity. The Framework acknowledges that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
5. The appeal site lies within a pedestrianised shopping street, within the heart of the town. The pedestrianised street is relatively wide and bordered by buildings of various architectural styles and periods, which predominately contain retail or commercial units on the ground floor. The vibrancy and relative openness of the street contribute towards its character.

6. The proposal seeks consent for a freestanding, internally illuminated, double-sided advertisement. I observed on my site visit that there are numerous, digital, freestanding advertisements along this pedestrianised street. There is also a plethora of street furniture in the locality, including benches, planters, street lighting and children's play equipment. Given the presence of similar advertisements and modern architecture in the immediate locality, I do not find that the proposal would appear out of keeping in this location.
7. The proposed advertisement by reason of its size and digitally illuminated nature would draw the eye. It would be seen in the context of other nearby advertisements and street furniture. In this case, adding another digital advertisement in such close proximity to the other freestanding advertisements and in combination with the existing street furniture would tip the balance and would result in excessive visual clutter within the street. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would erode the character of the street scene and would be harmful to the amenity of the area.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the advertisement is harmful to amenity. Although not determinative, I have had regard to Policies LP26 and LP28 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030, adopted March 2018 and Policy D8(k) of The London Plan, March 2021. These policies among other things seek to improve amenity, reduce street clutter and respect the local character of the area.

Other Matters

9. Although not a reason for refusal, the Council states in their delegated report that the proposal conflicts with development plan policies in respect to neighbouring amenity. The Council finds that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable degree of light pollution. The proposal would be similar to other advertisements that the Council has approved in the immediate locality. Given the above and based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I do not find that the proposal would be harmful to residential amenity.
10. While public safety does not form part of the Council's reason for refusal, the Council states that the proposal would fail to comply with development plan policies in terms of impact on highways. However, the Council and the highway authority confirm that sufficient clear footway width to accommodate safe and convenient movement of pedestrians would be retained and that the proposal would be unlikely to result in material harm to the safe and efficient operation of the highway. While I have found that the proposal would result in visual clutter, I do not find it would be harmful to public or highway safety.

Other Matters

11. The Regulations require that I exercise my powers with regards to amenity and public safety only. The benefits therefore cannot be taken into consideration in my decision.
12. I have had regard to the standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations. However, they would not overcome the harm that I have identified to amenity.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR