St Roy

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2008

by David Leeming

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 12 JUN 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/H/08/1202952
Heene Road Service Station, Heene Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 3RG

- 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 Primesight Advertising Ltd against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/08/0091/ADV, dated 30 January 2008, was refused by notice dated 17 Match 2008.
- The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated, double sided, free-standing advertisement display unit.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the visual impact of the proposed unit at the site and within the surroundings.

Reasons

3. Although the unit would be on the forecourt of a commercial site, it would occupy an exposed position alongside landscaping on the adjoining frontage and next to an existing approved but much smaller sign and also a road sign on the footpath. In such circumstances I consider that, because of its size and height, it would intrude unacceptably into this open and landscaped setting; that it would appear awkward alongside the smaller sign; and that together with this and the road sign it would create an impression of clutter in this location.

4. The surroundings contain many fine buildings, mostly in residential use, including the listed terrace on the seafront to the south. Despite its obvious commercial profile, the service station has generally restrained signage with, unusually, no totem sign displaying fuel prices. Exposed more widely to view within this setting, I consider that the impact of the fairly tall and bulky unit, emphasised by its full internal illumination after dark, would be intrusive.

5. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Leeming
INSPECTOR