



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2023

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/22/3305667

226 Camden High Street, London NW1 8QS

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for express consent to display an advertisement.
 - The appeal is made by London Lites Ltd against London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2022/0963/A is dated 10 March 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is One Advertising Mural hand painted on Brick Flank Wall. Measurements are 5.7m high by 8.4m wide. Colours Vary. Non Illuminated.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I am aware that the Council recommended refusal to the proposal with the decision notice dated 15 August 2022. However, they confirm this was not formally issued to the appellant until 5 September 2022. On the 23 August 2022 the appellant sought to appeal against non-determination of the proposal. I have therefore determined the appeal as a failure case. As part of my assessment, I have taken into account the Council's delegated decision and the reason they sought to refuse the advert, and have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the amenity of the appeal property and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to the first and second floor side elevation of No 226 Camden High Street which is situated at the junction with Hawley Crescent within the busy and colourful shopping area of Camden. The area is characterised by mainly independent commercial uses along Camden High Street. Camden has its own specific aesthetic with shops featuring a wide range of front fascia and projecting fascia signage, with many examples of unique and artistic approaches to advertising such as colourful painted murals and large 3D displays which gives the area a vibrant characteristic.
5. The appeal site is prominent as the side elevation is clearly visible within the street scene and the junction to which it is located allows clear visual exposure of the side of the building.

6. I noted from my site visit on the ground that the majority of the adverts along the high street relate to the commercial use taking place within the building they were located on, and therefore this link forms an important part of the local area's identity.
7. Whilst the appellant has stated that it is intended that the mural would be used to display advertisements products sold on the premises and in nearby Camden Market, which would help to personalise the display to the locality and connect it to the area, I see no way of ensuring that this would indeed be the case as relating adverts to the premises they are associated with is a fundamental feature of the local area. For these reasons, the scale of the mural would appear out of keeping and would not positively contribute to the unique character and amenity of the local area.
8. There has been historic signage previously erected at the site and therefore the principle of advertising on the site is accepted. However, I have no evidence before me to agree with the appellant that this proposal is similar in context. Also, even though the appellant draws my attention to the mural advertisement at the flank side opposite at 267 Camden High Street, I have no evidence before me to conclude whether or not this is an authorised advertisement. I therefore apportion only limited weight to it.
9. To conclude, the prominent display of advertisement that would not relate to the premises to which it would be associated would not reflect the key characteristics of the local area. Whilst not determinative in reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the aims of Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 which seeks, amongst other things to protect amenity, Policy D1 which requires development to respect local context and character, and Policy D4 which requires advertisements to preserve or enhance the character of their setting and host building.

Other Matters

10. Issues pertaining to the Council's service should be directed to them in the first instance and is not within my scope to comment upon.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed, and advertisement consent is refused.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

