
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2015

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI AIEMA

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

Decision date: 12 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/14/2229934

Ringley House, 349 Royal College Street, London, NW1 9QS

- 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 Mr David Field of Ringley LLP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/5891/A, dated 2 September 2014, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2014.
 - The advertisements proposed are described as 2 *No. internally illuminated projecting box signs*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the 2 *No. internally illuminated projecting box signs* as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. My site visit confirmed that there are four projecting signs on the building at present, which appear to include the signs applied for. It is clear from the written submissions that consent is sought for the two white text on red background signs only, and not for the two green signs. I note the Council's comments on the illumination of the existing projecting green signs, however this is not before me and is a separate matter for the Council to consider. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the proposal as seeking to the two red signs shown and not the green signs.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements in the interests of amenity.

Reasons

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), at Paragraph 67, provides that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. These reflect similar aims set out in the Advertisement Regulations. The Council has 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.
5. The wider area is characterised by a mixture of both residential buildings and commercial properties. In particular, the visual focus within the street scene

for commercial uses is on the ground floor, and I saw during my site visit that there are a number of examples of projecting signs; including both illuminated and non-illuminated. The appeal building is located on a corner plot, situated at the junction of Kentish Town Road and Royal College Street.

6. The Council point to the fact that the overall size and illumination of the signs dominate both street elevations, resulting in a cluttered and untidy appearance to the building. However, the signs themselves due to their relative size, siting on the ground floor level and direct link with the commercial activity inside, do not overly dominate the elevations of the building when viewed from Kentish Town Road or Royal College Street. Moreover, when viewed from the corner of the highway junction, the adverts are stepped back. In practice, this means that the primacy of the building's elevation when viewed from this aspect remains. As such, they do not detract from the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding street scene, and therefore would not harm amenity.
7. Given that I have found that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with the aims of the Council's Policies which seek to protect amenity. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the display of the two internally illuminated projecting box sign advertisements would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR