The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2016

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 May 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/Z/16/3143768
Malthouse Trading Estate, Brighton Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6RJ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr Paul Vickridge (Travis Perkins plc) against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1365/15, dated 14 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2016.
- The advertisement proposed is for replacement non-illuminated external advertisement signage for Travis Perkins plc (part retrospective) signs numbered 2, 4 and 5.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and consent for replacement non-illuminated external advertisement signage for Travis Perkins plc (part retrospective) signs numbered 2, 4 and 5 is granted. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the conditions set out in the Regulations.

Procedural Matters

2. For the sake of clarity I have used the description of the advertisements as set out on the Council's decision notice. The Council issued a split decision in which express advertisement consent was granted for replacement non-illuminated external advertisement signage for Travis Perkins plc (part retrospective) signs numbered 1,3,6,7,8 and 19. For the avoidance of doubt, this appeal relates only to the refusal of replacement non-illuminated external advertisement signage for Travis Perkins plc (part retrospective) signs numbered 2, 4 and 5 as set out in my final bullet above.

3. The signs are all in place. However, at the time of my visit some of the signs were partially covered by scaffolding and netting and were not fully visible. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a mainly industrial and commercial area. It is to the north of the A259, which is a very busy road. The majority of the

buildings along this stretch of the A259 are very large warehouses, some of these are close to the road frontage. Advertising in the area is not uncommon.

6. Proposed Sign 2 would be located on the wall adjacent to the west entrance of the appeal site. The design would be fairly simple. Its position would be helpful in that it would provide information on opening hours and customer safety. Street furniture and advertisements are present close by. However, Sign 2 would not be very large and the brick wall on which it would be located would be partially visible retaining a sense of space around it. It would therefore not appear cluttered.

7. The appeal building has a long and high front elevation and the front of the building is currently being painted in green and yellow colours similar to the proposed signs. The photographs of the previous signs which were supplied with the drawings indicate that there were originally four signs along this part of the building, albeit some were smaller than the proposed replacements.

8. Signs 4 and 5 would be located at the western and eastern ends of the front elevation of the building. The signs at either end would be separated by some distance and located high up away from the pavement. Each of the proposed signs would be located next to another sign which would be of a similar size and design, although they would display slightly different information. The colouring of the building and signs would ensure that they would not be overly prominent. I therefore consider proposed signs 4 and 5 would not lead to a cluttered appearance along the road frontage even with signs 3 and 6 in place.

9. I have taken account of saved Policy AB17 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 this seeks to protect visual amenity and so is material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would not cause harm to visual amenity the proposal does not conflict with this policy.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I consider that the proposed advertisements would not be detrimental to visual amenity. I shall therefore allow the appeal subject to the five standard conditions.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR