



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2003

by David Leeming

an Advertisement Appeal Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

L.C.
The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date
28 OCT 2003

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/H/03/1125711

The Jenny Lind, 80 High Street, Hampton Hill, Middlesex TW12 1NY

- The appeal is made under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Kim Beverley Crisford against the decision of Richmond-upon-Thames London Borough Council.
- The application (Ref.03/2508/ADV) is dated 23 June 2003.
- The advertisement under appeal is an illuminated "Fosters Lager" sign.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

1. The main issues in this appeal are the visual impact of the sign on the premises and within surrounding views.

Planning Policy

2. The Council refer to their advertisement control policies. The Regulations require that decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore the Council's policies alone cannot be decisive. But I have taken them into account as a material consideration.

Reasons

3. The premises are a two-storey domestic-scale public house located within the Hampton Hill Conservation Area, where special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. A strict control over the display of outdoor advertisements should therefore be maintained. However, well-sited signs of suitable size and design should normally be acceptable, provided that they do not spoil the character or appearance of the building or the area.
4. The appeal sign measures 0.84m by 0.61m. It occupies a central position between the two upper windows, where it projects forward directly above a flag pole holder. Although not particularly large, the sign has a modern box-like appearance and an irregular shape. The building has small-paned windows and other features that give it a somewhat old-style appearance. This is emphasised by the presence of a painted fascia and a pictorial inn sign on the frontage, the latter being also at first floor height. In recognition of its historic, architectural and townscape interest, I note that the Council have included it on a local list of buildings of townscape merit.
5. I consider that the appeal sign, with its uncompromisingly modern form and appearance, detracts from the otherwise well-ordered and traditional appearance of the frontage. Seen

in addition to the pictorial sign, I consider too that it gives rise to an impression of advertisement excess on the public house frontage.

6. As to its wider impact, I accept that views of the sign are restricted by the presence of the pictorial sign and by the more forward projection of the adjoining building. I note too the presence of the filling station and its prominent signage. However, the latter is outside the boundaries of the Conservation Area, which, for the most part, contains a mix of small shops and residential properties. In this particular wider context, I consider that the appeal sign, in its elevated frontage position and emphasised after dark by its illumination, detracts from the character and appearance of the street scene.

Conclusions

7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the display of the appeal sign is incompatible with the conservation status of the area and is detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Formal decision

8. In exercise of the powers transferred to me, I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Information

9. Particulars of the right of appeal against this decision to the High Court are enclosed for those concerned.



Advertiser Appeal Inspector