
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2015

by Jameson Bridgwater DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 February 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/14/2225735

Oxford Arms, 265 Camden High Street, LONDON NW1 7BU

- 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 Oxford Arms P.H. against the decision of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/4143/A, dated 19 June 2014, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2014.
 - The advertisement proposed is display of a temporary scaffold shroud screen advertisement printed on lightweight pvc around works scaffolding for a period of 8 months comprising a coloured 1:1 image of the building façade with an inset advertising area for public and commercial information (amendment to consent ref 2014/1002/A dated 14 April 2014).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the advertisement on the character and appearance of the Oxford Arms and the area.

Reasons

3. The Council have drawn my attention to the policies they consider to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.
4. The Oxford Arms is a prominent 3 storey corner property that is located at the junction of Camden High Street and Jamestown Road. The proposed advertisement would be located on the upper 2 floors of the Jamestown Road elevation, with external illumination. The advert would be part of a printed scaffold shroud screen, which would be displayed for a temporary period of 8 months while significant repairs are carried out to the public house.
5. The printed scaffold shroud screen showing façade imaging of the building behind and its location in a commercial area, would not in itself harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area. However, the externally illuminated advertisement panel that would measure approximately 6.2m by 8.1m would form an overly dominant feature due to its significant

size, elevated siting and illumination, when viewed from Camden High Street and Jamestown Road. I consider that a planning condition limiting the time at which the illuminated advertisement panel could operate would not sufficiently address the identified harm.

6. The appellant reasons that the proposal does not raise any significant amenity issues over and above those consented by the Council under reference 2014/1002/A. I have considered the earlier consent based on the information submitted by both the appellant and the Council, however given that the proposal was both smaller and non-illuminated it differs significantly to the scheme before me and I have therefore afforded little weight to this.
7. I acknowledge the appellant's assertion that standard builder's scaffold sheeting would have a poorer appearance and could be erected without consent. However, such sheeting would not include an illuminated advertisement, which I have found would in its own right cause unacceptable harm. I have therefore afforded little weight to this.
8. I appreciate that the renovations would improve the appearance of the building in the longer term. Despite this, I am mindful that the building could be renovated in such a way that would not result in the identified harm with the same long term benefits.
9. The appellant refers to a number of other schemes in the area (Camden Eye and Worlds End) and cites these as setting a precedent for this proposal. However, I have limited information about their histories, but inevitably their contexts would differ from that of the scheme before me, and so they do not lead me to a different view in this case.

Conclusion

10. I therefore find that the proposal by virtue of its size, position on the building, prominent siting and illumination would even for a temporary period cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. Having taken all other matters into account I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR