



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/25/3368113

Bus Shelter, Pavement Outside 166 High Street, Ruislip, HA4 8LJ

- 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 Mr Chris Reader (Transport for London) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 79313/ADV/2025/10.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as '*Internal illuminated sequential advertisement capable of static and dynamic content display with automatic rotation of images*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no concern regarding the effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety. I have no reason to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an existing bus shelter with a double-sided advertisement display as an integrated part of the shelter's design. It sits within a wide pavement along High Street with parades of shops to both sides and within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA). The Council's *Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal* (CAA), dated July 2010, identifies the High Street as a distinct character area within the CA comprising a commercial centre and busy, traditional shopping street with early 20th century shops in purpose-built parades with interesting architectural detailing, particularly at upper levels. The CAA goes on to recognise the generally good quality of the public realm along High Street, which I observed for myself, with street trees, sympathetic street lighting and other street furniture, including public seating, but that in recent years the introduction of modern shopfronts and signage, including those inappropriate in terms of size, position, design, materials, colour and degree of illumination, has had a negative effect.
4. The proposal would replace the bus shelter's existing internally illuminated advertisement displays, which face up and down the High Street on both its internal and external facades, with a double-sided digital LCD display screen.

5. During my visit I observed that the existing bus shelter, and integrated advertisement displays, are seen within the context of a variety of features within the public realm, including a free standing double sided poster display unit directly on the opposite side of the road and, just a short distance further along, a digital advertisement display to the back face of a black telephone kiosk. Combined with other street furniture, these have contributed to the general sense of creeping clutter and visual harm that is identified by the CAA.
6. I recognise that the physical form of the bus shelter would be unaffected by the proposal, and that given the existing advertisements, there would be no proliferation of their kind in terms of numbers. However, the permanently illuminated and regularly changing images on the digital display screens would comprise a noticeable shift from the static form of those existing. They would appear more prominent within the street scene, including in longer distance views in both directions along the High Street, where their presence would be significantly more conspicuous and contributory to an increasing accumulation of visual harm and negative change. As such, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
7. I have taken account of Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB1, DMHB4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHB13A of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), and Policies D3, D8 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021. Between them they either seek to protect amenity or ensure that the character and appearance of the historic environment is preserved or enhanced, and so they are material in this case. Given I have concluded that there would be harm to amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
8. Paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. It also states that the quality and character of places suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. Having viewed the site from various aspects along High Street, and observed the surrounding context, for the reasons given I find that the proposal would contribute to an accumulation of poorly sited and poorly designed advertisements within the street scene. This would be to the detriment of amenity. Other factors put to me by the appellants are not relevant to my assessment. Consequently, based upon the harm that I have identified, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR