

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2015

**By J L Cheesley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 18 June 2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/14/2229787**

**Outside Premier Inn, 141 Euston Road, Camden, London WC1H 9AA**

- 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 Derek Parkin, Infocus Public Networks Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2014/6077/A, dated 24 September 2014, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2014.
  - The advertisement proposed is illumination of a six sheet advertisement which enjoys already non-illuminated deemed consent.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:

the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene; and

the effect of the proposal on highway, pedestrian and cyclist's safety.

## Reasons

3. The advertisement is in place on the side of the payphone, without internal illumination. I note that both the payphone and a non-illuminated advertisement would remain, irrespective of the outcome of this appeal. Whether the existing light above the advertisement constitutes external illumination is not for my consideration. What is at issue is the effect of the proposed internal illumination.
4. The payphone is situated on a busy commercial road with street furniture and traffic signs one would expect in such a location. The payphone is situated on a wide pavement in an area where internally illuminated advertisements at this height do not prevail. Whilst there is an advertisement on the side of the nearby bus stop, I understand that does not have the benefit of deemed consent.
5. From my observations, due to the location of the advertisement and the proposed method of illumination, I consider that by internally illuminating the advertisement it would appear as an unacceptably incongruous and dominant

feature in the pedestrian environment, unacceptably add visual clutter and not be in keeping with the prevailing character or appearance of the surrounding area.

6. The advertisement faces on-coming traffic on Euston Road. I note that the advertisement would remain static and the appellant has confirmed the willingness to restrict the illumination to a single back light and prohibit movement and intermittence in any form. Nevertheless, the advertisement is close to a traffic light controlled junction on this busy road. In this area such illuminated advertisements facing on-coming traffic at this low level are not an overriding feature. Under these circumstances, I consider that the proposed illumination would distract drivers approaching the junction, particularly during hours of darkness. This would be to the detriment of highway, pedestrian and cyclist's safety.
7. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. The Council has referred to Policies CS5, CS11 and CS14 in the Camden Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DP16, DP21 and DP24 in the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025. The Regulations require that decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and, where applicable, public safety. Therefore, the Council's policies alone cannot be decisive. However, I have taken these policies into account as material considerations in my determination of this appeal.
8. I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on highway safety. I dismiss the appeal.

*J L Cheesley*

INSPECTOR