The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019

**by David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

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

**Decision date:31 July 2019**

**Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/Z/19/3229675**
**848 Chester Road, Erdington, Birmingham B24 0EH**

- 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 Sheikh Madah Subhani against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
- The application Ref 2019/00931/PA, dated 2 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2019.
- The advertisement proposed is a non-illuminated sign board attached to front boundary wall.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Reasons

2. The appeal relates to a detached property within a predominantly residential part of Chester Road, which is a busy thoroughfare.

3. The appellant works from home and explains that the sign is required to advertise his business and so that clients can find the property easily when driving along the highway. Whilst the advantages of the sign are not disputed, it would be large and it would enjoy an elevated position above the front boundary wall of the appeal dwelling. To my mind, the sign would appear overly prominent and incongruous within what is a long row of private dwellings.

4. The appellant refers to other commercial signs within the local area. I do not know the precise planning circumstances of the examples referred to. Furthermore, from what I could see, in the main they appear to relate to properties in commercial use, whereas the sign before me would relate to a building whose predominant use remains as a dwelling. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its merits and against the specific context within which it would sit.

5. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would fail to respond to the character and appearance of the local area and would thereby harm amenity. In such terms, it conflicts with policy PG3 of the adopted Birmingham Development Plan and saved paragraph 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan, which although not decisive, are material considerations in the determination of the appeal.

*David Fitzsimon* INSPECTOR