
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2015

by G J Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19/10/2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/Z/15/3069996

York Way, corner of Freight Lane, London, N1C 4BE

- 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 KDT Management Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/1572/A, dated 16 March 2015, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2015.
 - The advertisement proposed is one freestanding advertising display with internal illumination.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of one freestanding advertising display with internal illumination, 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the junction of York Way and Freight Lane, and the advertisement would face the intersection of the two roads. It would comprise a freestanding sign set on the embankment of a raised section of railway, a bridge for which passes over York Way, adjacent to the site. An additional railway bridge passes over York Way, to the north, and the street dips between the two bridges. The appeal site is currently informally landscaped as a grassed bank.
4. The appeal proposal is a revision of a previous proposal for a freestanding sign, which was dismissed at appeal¹. The Inspector of that appeal found that the height and bulk of the proposed sign rendered it unacceptable. The current scheme proposes a significantly smaller illuminated sign, with associated landscaping.
5. The appeal site is within an area of significant change, with building works and residential intensification currently taking place beyond the railway bridges to the north and adjacent to the site. The strip of land between the bridges,

¹ Appeal ref: APP/X5210/Z/14/2223406; decision date: 8 January 2015.

which includes the appeal site, accommodates industrial uses and this is reflected in its immediate character, although residential buildings are visible from this area. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) contains advice on the location of advertisements in industrial areas².

6. The appeal site is not highly visible in any of the three extended street approaches to the site. Of the three, it would be most visible from the York Way approach from the north, but due to the restriction of long sight-lines resulting from the northern railway bridge, the road-edge embankments and dip, visibility of the sign would be limited until the viewer would be almost upon the intersection of Freight Way. The orientation of the sign would limit its visibility on the other two routes, meaning that for journeys from Freight Way or York Way from the south, its content would only be legible from the intersection.
7. The limited dimensions of the sign would allow it to be viewed against the background embankment, and it would not significantly protrude above the level of the adjoining railway. This, along with its visibility as described above, would restrict any harmful effects on the amenity of the surrounding area. The only other large sign in the area is a directional sign to the north of the site, which is also visible on the northern approach from York Way. However, both signs would not be visible together, and the appeal proposal would not contribute to a sense of increased advertising clutter or over-proliferation of such features. The proposed illumination would provide some additional lighting of the adjacent pavement, which would provide some limited benefit to the amenity of the area. As such, the advertisement would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood around the site.
8. I have taken into account the Council's comments regarding the impact of the sign on the wider amenity of the area, but consider that despite the 'gateway' location of the appeal site, any harm caused by the advertisement would be limited, for the reasons set out above. I have also considered its initiative to remove large-scale advertisement hoardings within its boundaries, but do not consider that this proposal would have a harmful impact with regard to the creation of visual clutter, for the reasons that I have set out above.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would not have a harmful impact on the amenity of the area. The Council has drawn my attention to *Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025* Policies CS5 and CS14, and *Camden Development Policies 2010-2025* Policy DP24, which it considers to be relevant to this appeal. I have taken these into account as a material consideration. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these Policies.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G J Rollings

INSPECTOR

² PPG Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306.