



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/Z/19/3229236

51/A Coleridge Street, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 5AB

- 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 Robbie Raggio against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2019/00695, dated 6 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is the Display of 1no non-illuminated advertising hoarding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development of the proposal from the Council's decision notice as it simply and accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace property, located at the junction of Coleridge Street and Sheridan Terrace. The surrounding area comprises mainly of terraced dwellings although there are also several commercial premises in the locality. However, the area is predominately residential in character and appearance.
5. The proposed advertisement hoarding would be located on the elevation of the building which faces Sheridan Terrace. Whilst I note that the proposed advertisement hoarding has been reduced in size compared to a previous proposal, it would nonetheless be excessively large in size and scale and would appear as a highly dominant and incongruous feature in relation to the host property. Furthermore, the proposed advertisement hoarding would be visually prominent when viewed from both Sheridan Terrace and Coleridge Street due to its overall size and scale and positioning on the building.
6. The proposed hoarding would be a visually intrusive and inharmonious feature which would be at odds with the predominantly residential character of

Coleridge Street and Sheridan Terrace and as such, would adversely affect the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

7. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan as far as material. Policies QD13 and QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. I have concluded that the advertisement hoarding would harm amenity, and therefore the appeal proposal conflicts with these policies.

Other Matter

8. The appellant has provided photographs of other advertisement hoardings in Hove. However, I have not been provided with the planning history of these hoardings or any evidence as to whether their siting and context is similar in any way to the appeal proposal. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits and I afford only little weight to this matter.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR