



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2011

by John L Gray DipArch MSc Registered Architect

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 February 2011

Appeal Ref. APP/X5210/H10/2139181

187 Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JY

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Remedia International UK Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application, ref. 2010/4028/A, dated 21 July 2010, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2010.
 - The advertisement proposed is the continued display of an illuminated hoarding (12m x 8m) on scaffolding on the Parkway elevation of the building.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant consent for the continued display of an illuminated hoarding (12m x 8m) on scaffolding on the Parkway elevation of 187 Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JY, in accordance with consent ref. 2008/4116/A, granted on appeal by decision dated 30 March 2009, and the conditions attached thereto. This consent is for one year from the date of this decision.

Reasons

2. Consent to display the advertisement was granted on appeal in March 2009 for a period of one year from the date of the decision. The appeal decision considers the then proposal "an acceptable temporary addition to the townscape" and an "improvement to the otherwise alternative utilitarian vista", meaning the shrouded scaffolding while building works were being undertaken. The appellant appears to have been seeking consent for a period of one year, although not with the starting date as the date of the decision. The application subject of this appeal was to continue to display the advertisement for the remaining four months of the year thought originally to have been applied for – until 30 November 2010.
3. When I made my site inspection on 12 January 2011, the scaffolding, shroud and advertisement remained in place and I could see no indication of how works to the building were progressing. The only reason that could justify continued display of the advertisement is because it enlivens what would otherwise be a "utilitarian vista" while building works are in progress behind the shrouded scaffolding. I am sure it is in the appellant's interests that those should be completed as quickly as possible, the scaffolding and shroud removed and the building restored to effective use. It is certainly in the interests of the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area that that should happen – because the existence of the advertisement (not to mention the shrouded scaffolding) damages both and conflicts with

what is sought by Core Strategy Policy CS14 and Development Policy DP25, which have now superseded the saved UDP Policies B4b and B7 referred to in the refusal notice.

4. The Council cites various other (then emerging) LDF policies in its reason for refusal of the application but it is unclear to me that they should apply to the practicalities of this case. So long as the display of the advertisement is viewed as temporary, for the duration of refurbishment works, then it is a livelier alternative to the shrouded scaffolding. But, as soon as works to the building have been completed, and the scaffolding and shroud can for practical purposes be removed, then the advertisement becomes an inappropriate and unacceptable feature in the Conservation Area townscape.
5. The appellant has now furnished details of the anticipated duration of refurbishment works, completion being expected around the end of 2011. Accordingly, I conclude that, despite the harm to the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area and the conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS14 and Development Policy DP25, the advertisement remains an acceptable feature while building works are in progress. Accordingly, its continued display is appropriate for a further period of one year from the date of this decision.

John L Gray

Inspector