



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2026 by I Ingledew BSc (Hons)

Decision by T Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/Z/25/3372855

Pavement on Island o/s, 3-5 Winston Way, Ilford IG1 2FS

- 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 JCDecaux UK Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2780/24.
 - The advertisement proposed is Installation of an internally illuminated freestanding double-sided digital advertisement unit - advertised space measuring 1065mm x 1895mm.
-

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 Matters

3. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal, and I have taken them into account as material considerations. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. In my determination of this appeal, the policies by themselves have not been decisive.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on public safety, and the effect on the amenity of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Public Safety

5. The appeal site is located on a pedestrianised island within a signalised junction of Winston Way and Chapel Way, a multi-lane highway where motorists are required to assess traffic conditions and select the appropriate lane, with onward travel controlled by signal controls. At the time of my site visit, I observed this junction was heavily trafficked and observed instances of lane confusion from drivers.

6. The pedestrianised traffic island provides three signal-controlled crossing points, allowing pedestrians and cyclists to cross the two major roads in stages. Within the island, pedestrians and cyclists are separated by a designated footway and cycle path, providing a clear, convenient route between crossings. Sufficient width is retained for the two pathways, and a modest arrangement of street furniture at this location provides clear, legible sightlines across these pathways. From the crossing of Chapel Way, there is a convenient, unobstructed route across the traffic island to the pedestrian crossing at the northern boundary with Chapel Way.
7. The proposed advertisement unit would be located approximately 4.5m behind the road sign facing oncoming traffic and 6.7m in front of the traffic light, near to the northern crossing point. This would introduce a visually prominent and attention seeking feature into an environment where concentration demands are already high. Although the display would not physically obscure traffic signals or signage it would nevertheless present a potential distraction by way of its illuminated display and changing images. In an area where demand on attention is already high, with the evidence before me showing a high number of recorded collisions in the existing condition, the positioning, scale and illuminated nature would introduce an unreasonable additional distraction where attention to road signage and signal controls is important. This would increase the risk of driver error and collision and would therefore introduce a level of unacceptable harm to public safety.
8. The proposed advertisement unit would be located within the pedestrian route across the island. Its location would intrude into the natural pedestrian desire line across the island, disrupting an established and convenient route to the northern crossing. While space would remain around the unit, the likely consequence would be pedestrians diverting into the adjacent cycle path, leading to reduced comfort and increased interaction between users, harming the ability for pedestrians and cyclists to safely pass each other.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would result in unacceptable harm to public safety. Although not determinative, I have had regard to Policies LP26 and LP28 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (March 2018) (RLP) and Policy T2 and T4(f) of the London Plan (2021), and have concluded that the proposed advertisement does not accord with these policies which, amongst other things, seek to ensure development and advertisements are appropriately designed so as not to increase road danger, whilst delivering land use patterns that facilitate walking and cycling.

Amenity

10. The proposed advertisement would be located within a prominent traffic junction near the commercial centre of Ilford. The surrounding townscape is characterised by a mix of large-scale retail and smaller commercial units, including a supermarket to the south and a line of shops along Chapel Way to the north. The traffic island itself contains a modest amount of street furniture, including railings and signage to the north, and planting and a sculpture at the southern point. These are arranged to create a clear, legible environment for pedestrians serving as a functional space for the crossing of the junction. A comparable freestanding advertisement unit is also evident nearby on the pavement along Winston Way near to the supermarket.
11. The presence of advertising in this vicinity is not unfamiliar, and the commercial character of the surroundings is such that an advertisement unit would not appear

incongruous in principle at the proposed location within the traffic island. The proposed unit would retain sufficient space from the existing street furniture so as not to create visual clutter, and its scale would not overwhelm the existing features. While it would introduce a modern and illuminated effect, this would not be incongruous with its modern, commercial surroundings. Although the council have referred to Policy T2 of the LP in their reason for refusal, this policy relates to healthy streets and aims to reduce car dependency and not the amenity of the area. It has not therefore been determinative on this matter.

12. For the reasons above, I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would not result in harm to the amenity of the area. Although not determinative, I have had regard to Policies LP26 and LP28 of the RLP which, amongst other things, seek to ensure development and advertisements are appropriately designed to respect the local character of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

I Ingledew

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

T Law

INSPECTOR