

Delegated Report			Expiry Date:	19/05/2010
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Matthias Gentet			2016/1693/A	
Application Address			Application Type:	
Regina House 124 Finchley Road LONDON NW3 5HT			Advertisement Consent	
1st Signature	2nd Signature (If refusal)	Conservation	Recommendation(s):	
			Refuse Advertisement Consent	
Proposal(s)				
LED advertisement display sign to side elevation at first floor level (retrospective).				
Consultations				
Summary of consultation responses:		N/A		
Site Description				
The application site is a 7-storey commercial building (with retail at ground floor level and offices to upper levels) located on the border and within Fitzjohns & Netherhall Conservation Area, and in a prominent location. Although not listed, it has been identified as a positive contributor to the special character and appearance of the conservation area.				
Relevant History				
<u>Application Site:</u>				
2014/3174/A – (refused on 18/07/2014) - Display of one internally illuminated fascia sign at first floor level of building.				
2013/2349/A – (refused on 19/06/2013 but allowed on appeal on 10/03/2014) - The display of an internally illuminated display board to the side elevation above existing retail unit (Class A1) at first floor level.				
<u>Neighbouring Sites:</u>				
2013/8151/A – (refused on 14/02/2014 and dismissed on appeal on 27/06/2014) - Digital media display on a freestanding advertising display unit - <u>Land adj. 135 Finchley Road.</u>				
2013/7024/A – (refused on 03/01/2014 and dismissed on appeal on 27/06/2014) - Installation of a free standing LED internally illuminated public information display sign - <u>Jewish Community Centre, 341-3 51 Finchley Road.</u>				
2013/2419/A – (refused on 01/07/2013 and dismissed on appeal on 11/02/2014) - Display of 1x				

internally illuminated advertising hoarding at second floor level to side elevation replacing existing hoarding on property - 1a New College Parade, Finchley Road.

2012/1491/A – (refused on 16/05/2012 and dismissed on appeal on 13/12/2012) - Erection of a double sided free standing totem with digital screens - The O2 Centre, 255 Finchley Road.

2012/0076/A – (refused on 31/05/2012 and dismissed on appeal on 11/01/2013) - Display of internally illuminated digital display panel on monopole - Land adjacent to 135 Finchley Road.

Other Sites within the borough:

2015/6179/A – (refused on 01/02/2016) - Installation of 1 x digital LED display screen (3.846m x 6.596m) - Adjacent to Camden Town Underground Station, Camden High Street.

2015/3210/A – (refused on 24/08/2015 and dismissed on appeal on 18/11/2015) - Display of 1x digital display screen (6.0 x 39.8 metres) to Tottenham Court Road elevation at 1st and 2nd floor level - St Giles Hotel, Bedford Avenue.

2015/1209/A – (refused and warning of prosecution action to be taken on 24/04/2015) - Display of a digital illuminated signage measuring 6.6m x 3.4m x 0.4m at 1.9m from ground level - Adjacent to Whitefield Memorial Church, Tottenham Court Road.

2014/4102/A – (refused on 18/07/2014 and dismissed on appeal on 08/01/2014) - Display of a free standing internally illuminated sign - On the corner of York Way and Freight lane.

2014/4108/A – (refused on 18/07/2014 and dismissed on appeal on 04/12/2014) - Display of a free standing internally illuminated sign in the forecourt - British Telecom, 138 Maida Vale.

2014/1027/A – (refused on 26/03/2014 and dismissed on appeal on 02/03/2015) - Erection of a free standing digital advertisement display unit - Royal Mail Delivery Office, 1 Barnby Street.

2013/6400/A – (refused on 22/10/2013 and dismissed on 31/12/2013) - Display of digital screen to front elevation of hospital - University College Hospital, 235 Euston Road.

2012/4564/A – (refused on 18/10/2012 and dismissed on appeal on 11/07/2013) - Display of digital screen and lettering to front elevation of hospital - University College Hospital, 235 Euston Road.

2009/2923/A – (refused on 06/10/2009) - Installation of digital LED screen (1.8m x 9.4m) at fascia level on corner of West End Lane and Blackburn Road to display advertisements (changing every 7-10 seconds) - 124 West End Lane.

Site Enforcement History:

- EN15/0910 - Erection of illuminated animated advertising sign at 1st floor level. Previous REFUSED applications for similar at this address.
- EN16/0404 - Unauthorised display of an internally illuminated hanging sign to the north end of the undercroft in relation to the solicitors located to the south end side of the building.

The following enforcement cases are to be taken into consideration as being relevant to the refusal of this proposal, representing and supporting the Council's initiative to remove unsightly hoardings:

- EN09/0102 – Land adjoining 279 Finchley Road - display of two advert hoardings (Appeal against discontinuance notice dismissed: 26/02/2013)
- EN07/0473 – Central School of Speech and Drama College Crescent - Display of two advert hoardings, each 1 x 48 sheet (Appeal against discontinuance notice dismissed 21/05/2013)

Relevant policies

Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies

DP21 – Development connecting to the highway network

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2015 (as amended)

CPG1 (Design) Chapter 8

Fitzjohns & Netherhall Conservation Area (Designated 01/03/1984)

Planning Enforcement Initiative to remove unsightly advertisement hoardings in the Borough

1. Background

- 1.1 This application is the third of a series of advert consent applications for the display of a LED internally illuminated digital advertising sign at the site address since 2013 (full details in Relevant History above), and is submitted as a result of an enforcement case (Ref: EN15/0910) which was opened for the unauthorised display of a digital sign at first floor level of the side elevation.
- 1.2 There is an LED internally illuminated digital advertisement already in situ, however what has been shown on the plans submitted as part of this application do not reflect what has been installed on site.
- 1.3 The previous applications were both refused. The first refusal (Ref: 2013/2349/A) was taken to appeal, and was consequently allowed for a LED internally illuminated digital sign measuring 3m in height by 2m in width. The second refusal (Ref: 2014/3174/A) for a larger LED internally illuminated digital sign measuring 3.9m in height by 2.7m in width, was not appealed.
- 1.4 The main reason for the appeal of application 2013/2349/A, was the effect on visual amenity.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is seeking advert consent for the display of a LED internally illuminated digital advertisement, attached to the north facing side of the host building at first floor level, and overlapping/cutting across an established white line at the base of the upper part of the building.
- 2.2 The advertisement measures 3.53m in height by 2.56m in width with a depth of 0.25m, and faces the incoming traffic travelling south toward Swiss Cottage.
- 2.3 It must be noted at this stage that the proposed elevation drawing submitted as part of the documents to be approved, is not a true representation of what is currently on site. It is what has been shown on the proposed plans which is part of the assessment within this report.
- 2.4 The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 permits the Council to only consider amenity and public safety matters in determining advertisement consent applications.

3. Amenity

- 3.1 Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 (Design) clearly states that hoarding advertising may be acceptable where they satisfactorily relate to the scale of the host building and its surroundings. They should be designed and positioned as an integral feature of the building. Advertisements should respect the form, fabric, design and scale of the host building and setting.
- 3.2 Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 (Design) also states that advertisements obscuring architectural features would not be considered acceptable.
- 3.3 The proposed advert is greater in size compared to what was allowed at Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/13/2203816. As proposed the advert, including frame is considered to dominate the side elevation of the building due to its excessive size.

3.4 The Planning Inspector stated in the report that 'the height would exceed the width of the sign reflecting the vertical emphasis of the building. The size of the sign would be particularly modest by comparison to the extent of the side elevation of the host property. It would also not be excessive in size by reference to those buildings to either side, which although not as large are still relatively imposing structures with four storeys including those in the roof. The sign would therefore be appropriate in relation to matters such as its design, illumination, size and position.'

3.5 The Inspector's comments are based on the original scheme which was for a smaller sign (measuring 3m in height by 2m in width), but also in a more acceptable location. The siting of the proposed advert, together with its size and use of a thicker surround, result in a dominant and unbalanced addition to the site elevation which would cause detrimental harm to the visual amenity of the area. It is important to note that in accordance with DP24, development should consider the prevailing pattern, the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities, and the composition of elevations, given the scale of the advert it is not considered this would be adhered to and the enlarged advert would cause harm to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

3.6 With regard to method of illumination the previous appeal allowed an internally illuminated sign. Therefore, no objection could be raised in respect of its illumination.

3.7 Application (Ref: 2014/3174/A) was also refused by virtue of the impact on the visual amenity of the area due to the size and siting of the advert. Although the advertisement proposed as part of this application is smaller, it is not considered to overcome the previous reason for refusal and would cause detrimental harm to the visual amenity of the area by reason of its size, siting and design and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, streetscape and conservation Area, contrary to DP25.

4. Public Safety

4.1 The method of illumination of the proposed LED internally illuminated digital advertisement would not raise any concerns subject to conditions to control the level of illumination and movement/timings of the display, in terms of public safety and is not considered to be a distraction to the moving traffic.

4.2 The public safety aspect of the proposal, in terms of the method of illumination, size and the location of the LED digital sign is therefore considered acceptable.

5. Recommendation

5.1 Refuse advertisement consent

