



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003493

39 Station Road, West Drayton, Hillingdon UB7 7LN

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Atif Khan of Ravvi Spice Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 24730/ADV/2025/42.
 - The advertisement proposed is flat aluminium base signs with protruding back-lit LED lettering.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposed advertisements in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. This is different to the description used by the Council in its decision notice, to which the appellant did not formally agree, which stated, '*installation of 2 no. internally illuminated fascia signs and vertical light strips.*' The application form and plans show that the advertisements are intended to be lit through rear illuminated lettering and Light-emitting diode (LED) strips. I have assessed the appeal on this basis.
3. The appellant has submitted plans which differ to those cited on the Council's decision notice. It is stated that a revised plan¹ was submitted to the Council on 3 December 2025, i.e. before the Council determined the application on 17 December 2025. This plan removes the proposed vertical LED strips and the illumination to the upper fascia sign.
4. I observed during my site visit that advertisements are already in place. It appeared that the vertical LED strips to the side of the building have not been included. However, given that my site visit was during daylight hours, I cannot be certain as to the level of illumination which has been installed, or indeed which version of the plans has been implemented.
5. The Council has confirmed that although received prior to determination, it did not undertake a re-consultation or consider the amended plan in its assessment of the application.
6. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the appeal against the original plan² upon which the Council made its decision. The revised plan represents a

¹ 'Proposed Signage Areas to Station Road' – 25/989/11 Revision B

² 'Proposed Signage Areas to Station Road' – 25/989/11 Revision A

fundamental change to the application and its acceptance through the appeal process would cause procedural unfairness to interested parties, as it would deprive those entitled to be consulted on an application the opportunity to make a representation.

7. For the same reasons I have also not considered the potential further amended signage option presented within Appendix C of the appellant's statement.
8. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) sets out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. The Council's reason for refusal relates specifically to matters of amenity. There was no objection raised on the grounds of public safety, and I find no reason to take a different view on that matter.

Main Issue

9. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

10. The appeal site is within an established mixed-use area with a high level of commercial activity. The appeal property forms a mid-terraced two storey building within a row of similarly scaled buildings, all with a commercial frontage at ground floor level. The units within the terraced row all have fascia signs above the shopfronts.
11. Advertisements, including fascia signs, are a prevalent feature in both the terraced row and the wider area. Existing fascia signs vary considerably in their size, colour and material finish. I observed during my site visit that means of illumination for advertisements are also present within the terraced row which the appeal site forms part of, and the wider street scene. Overall, this creates a diverse and visually dynamic street environment, typical of a suburban high street.
12. Notwithstanding the existing diversity in advertisements present, the appeal proposal would introduce a high-level fascia sign towards the top of the building, with an illuminated logo. This would be at odds with the established positioning of advertisements elsewhere in the immediately surrounding area.
13. Even with the proposed means of rear illumination, the illumination associated with the high-level fascia sign, coupled with the vertical LED strip lighting to almost the full height of the building, would lead to the advertisements being overly prominent and visually obtrusive features within the terraced row and the wider street scene.
14. I have limited details in the evidence before me to previous advertisement consents in the area. Nevertheless, none of the existing advertisements which I observed, or which have been presented through the evidence, display the same combination of high level and vertical illumination which would arise through the appeal proposal. I therefore do not find that the existing illuminated advertisements in the area are directly comparable to a degree that they would justify the appeal proposal before me.

15. Rather than leading to an enhancement to the street scene, the proposed advertisements would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area.
16. Although not on their own determinative, my conclusion indicates that there would be conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 13 and DMHB 13A of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that proposals are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area, seeking good design in new development including shopfronts.
17. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

18. The proposed advertisements would have associated economic benefits including the activation of the site frontage. They would also assist in wayfinding in a busy mixed-use area which has associated benefits to the business, supporting a vibrant nighttime economy and to public safety. Noting the scale of the appeal proposal, the benefits associated would be modest.
19. Moreover, I am not satisfied that the appeal proposal is the only reasonable or least harmful means of achieving these benefits. The benefits therefore do not outweigh the harm which I have identified to the amenity of the area.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that whilst there would be no harm to public safety, the appeal proposal would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR