The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2013

by Simon Miles BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/H/13/2192950
Ropetackle, Adur Business Centre, Little High Street, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5EG

- 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 Robert Wright of Basepoint Centres Ltd against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1445/12, dated 20 November 2012, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2013.
- The advertisements proposed are 3 No fascia signs.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to the Ropetackle Building, a prominent building with a distinctive clock tower. This tower is already marked out with the Ropetackle lettering running vertically. The site is adjacent to, but not within, the Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area.

4. The proposed additional signs, by reason of their size and position at a high level on the tower, would detract from the simple treatment and clean lines of the tower, resulting in a cluttered appearance and undermining the quality and integrity of the original design. Whilst I am not persuaded that this would cause serious harm to the setting of the adjacent conservation area, the character and appearance of the building, and its positive contribution to the immediate streetscape, would be harmed.

5. Whilst acknowledging the other advertisements in the area, and similar advertisements at other locations, my assessment is based on the particular circumstances of the proposal before me. These include the particular character and features of this locally distinctive building, in which respect I find those other cases of little relevance.

6. This leads me to conclude that the proposed advertisements would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This objection is

not outweighed by the commercial needs of the appellant, as these could be adequately met by means of a more appropriate design approach.

7. Whilst noting the various policies cited by the parties, the Regulations to control advertisements may only be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The Council's policies are therefore not decisive in themselves.

8. Overall, given my findings and in view of the harm caused to the visual amenity of the area, I find that the appeal should not succeed

Simon Miles

INSPECTOR