

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 7 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/Z/17/3174585
126 Southampton Street, Reading RG1 2QX

- 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 Surjit Juttla against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 170051, dated 16 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is to install an advertising board on side of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description on the planning application form stated that development was sought "to install an adverting board on side of property". I have amended this description in the box heading above to "to install an advertising board on side of property" as I consider this to be a more accurate description of what is proposed and the change does not prejudice the appellant.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The Council refers to development plan policies. The Regulations require that decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and, where applicable, public safety. Therefore, the development plan policies alone cannot be decisive, but I have taken them into account as material considerations. The proposals would not result in any material harm to highway or public safety.
 5. The appeal site is situated close to the town centre of Reading. 126 Southampton Street is an end-of-terrace house in a row of dwellings with a very similar appearance. They are situated on a road which provides an important north-bound route into Reading. No.126 is on the corner with West Hill.
 6. The application is for the erection of an advertisement hoarding which would be made of aluminium and would be about 2m high and about 3m wide. The height from the ground to the base of the advertisement would be about 3m (the ground slopes upwards up West Hill). It would be installed on the flank
-

elevation of no.126 Southampton Street and it would not be illuminated. At the time of my site visit the flank wall appeared as if it had previously had an advertisement on it and indeed the appellant confirms this, producing a photograph of a larger advertisement on the flank wall of the appeal site. However, he does not indicate or produce documentation to show whether or not the advertisement hoarding was authorised or not.

7. Whilst the location of the appeal site is close to the centre of Reading and on a road where there are some commercial uses, I consider that the immediate area is predominantly residential. In the proposed location, the hoarding would harm the domestic character and appearance of the residential terrace and of West Hill. It would be unduly prominent, appearing out of place on the flank wall of the modestly-sized dwelling, and it would fail to respect its surroundings and setting.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed advertisement hoarding would unacceptably harm the amenity of the area.

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal and refuse consent for the proposed advertisement.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR