
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2016

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/H/16/3156826

830-840 Bath Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 5LQ

- 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 G Obee of Motorline against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03132/A, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The advertisement is illuminated free-standing sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisement as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Procedural matter

2. I have taken into account the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), issued on 6 March 2014, in reaching my decision.
3. In respect of the planning application referred to in the third bullet point of the above header, this included other signs as well as that concerned. Those other signs were granted express consent by the Council and so are not for consideration.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.
 6. The site is in a prominent corner location on the edge of a commercial area and a gateway into Bristol. Although a prominent site, it is seen very much as part of the surrounding commercial area which includes a number of freestanding signs in front of the various buildings.
-

7. I saw that the pylon sign concerned has been installed as shown on the submitted details. It is fairly close to another existing sign of similar proportions. However, both are set away from the adjacent roads by a wide footway area on this junction corner and seen in the context of the other signs referred to above. In respect of the site itself, the sign is also seen in the context of existing commercial paraphernalia in the large forecourt area including banners alongside the roadside boundary. The many cars displayed for sale add to the clearly commercial appearance of the site.
8. The sign is also seen against the backdrop of those existing commercial buildings and on the approach from the south is significantly softened or screened by trees located along the roadside frontage of the site. On the approach from the east, travelling towards Bristol, it is not seen full on as it is sited to face roughly north and south. Therefore, although the other existing nearby pylon sign on the site is facing roughly east and west, from that eastern approach the two signs do not have a combined dominating effect. The sign is also seen in the context of a significant amount of street furniture at the adjacent road junction, notably street lights and traffic lights. Due to that high degree of such lighting, this would also lessen the prominence of the sign when illuminated after dark.
9. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the sign concerned, when combined with the other existing signage in the location, does not cause an unacceptable level of visual clutter and is not a dominant feature of the site and surrounding area.
10. Therefore, and taking into consideration the Framework, the advertisement is not materially detrimental to amenity.
11. In its decision notice, the Council has referred to policies DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies and policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy which seek to protect amenity. Given that I have concluded that the advertisement does not harm amenity, it does not conflict with these policies.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR