
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/Z/17/3176238

Bridge House, 1, High Street, Coltishall, Norfolk NR12 7AA

- 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 Gaetano Tamburello against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20170168, dated 26 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 x externally illuminated banner advertisement (Sign B).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original planning application submitted to the Council was for 2 signs (Signs A and B). The Council refused Sign B only and as such I have amended the description of development to refer to one sign only and considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether Sign B would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Coltishall Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The site is located within the Coltishall Conservation Area (CA), and an Area of Special Control of Advertisements (ASCA). The site is currently occupied by a Bed and Breakfast business, with associated parking. The front boundary comprises a red brick wall, where signs A and B have been affixed. The area is attractive in character with a large area of open space and landscaping opposite the site which forms part of the Broads National Park. There are a number of historic and traditional properties in the surrounding area, with red brick, render and flint used which result in visually pleasant surroundings and adds to the character of the area. Bridge House itself is a large rendered property.
5. The signage is already in situ on the front wall of the site. Sign A is adjacent to the access point into the site and Sign B is located closer to the road bridge. However both signs are reasonably close to one another. The blue backgrounds

of the signs result in them being prominent against the backdrop of the red brick wall, and whilst the design and colouring is reasonably tasteful, the cumulative effect of both of the signs appears excessive and unnecessary. The presence of both signs results in a cluttered appearance which detracts from the overall attractive character of the CA. On this basis sign B does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

6. The National Planning Policy Framework requires proposals affecting heritage assets to be considered having regard to any harm caused to their significance and that any less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development. I consider that the cumulative effect of both signs result in a less than substantial harm to the CA as although the design of the signs is acceptable, their cumulative effect is harmful and, whilst I note that the provision of signage along the site frontage may have benefits to those visiting the site and the running of the business, these benefits can be achieved via sign A alone.
7. The site is located close to the bridge and therefore I acknowledge that without signage, any vehicles travelling across the bridge may miss, or need to brake sharply for, the access given its location. However, I consider that the presence of sign A is sufficient to allow drivers to locate the access into the site and the presence of both signs, relatively close to one another, is not necessary. Therefore sign B would not provide any additional highway safety benefits over and above sign A.
8. The Appellant has stated that both signs are critical to the success of the business, however I consider that the location of the bed and breakfast is adequately highlighted by sign A and that sign B is not necessary given its location. Because I have found that Sign B is unnecessary the benefits do not outweigh the harm to the CA in this instance.
9. There is no statutory requirement to consider the proposed advertisement against the development plan. However, given the above considerations, the development would not accord with Policies GC4 and EN2 of the Broadland District Council Development Management DPD (2015) which require development to avoid significant detrimental impact, pay regard to the environment, character and appearance of an area and protect and enhance the CA. The sign would also be contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (Amended 2014) which seeks to protect the landscape character and historic environment. Furthermore, the development would be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches great importance to good design and the conservation of Conservation Areas.

Other Matters

10. During my visit, I noted the other signs within the CA near to the appeal site, including the garage signs. However, I do not know the particular circumstances behind these examples, and, in any case, they do not represent positive contributors to the character and appearance of the area. Each application and appeal must be considered on its own merits and I can give little weight to these in my considerations.
11. The site is located opposite part of the Broads National Park, which hosts some protected species. The sign, in particular the lighting, would not have any

detrimental impact on protected species in this instance as the lighting would be directed to the banners and this would limit any upward and horizontal light spill.

12. I note that the Appellant has stated that extensive vegetation clearance was carried out along the wall, which enhanced the appearance of the area. However, I have considered the appeal in relation to the site as existing and the previous appearance of the site carries little weight in this instance.
13. I have had regard to the letters of support from the Council's Tourism Officer, Broads Tourism and others but these do not alter my overall conclusion for the reasons given.
14. Local concerns have been raised in relation to impacts on neighbouring living conditions. However due to my findings above, it is not necessary for me to consider these further in this instance, as they would not alter my overall conclusions on the proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR