



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2019

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/Z/19/3229876

Funtley Court, 19 Funtley Hill, Fareham PO16 7UY

- 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 Drysdale Investments Limited and Lindberg Investments Limited against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. P/19/0268/AD, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 4 No. signs in three locations, 1220 X 1600mm; supported on posts; non illuminated.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements on the visual amenity of Funtley Hill.

Reasons

3. Although the application site is used for business purposes it is located in a primarily residential area with a countryside setting. On my visit to the site I saw four signs in three locations, with all of them positioned immediately behind the front boundary wall and therefore having a 'back of pavement' location.
4. I acknowledge that signs at the two main entrances to the site are necessary to inform visitors of these access points, although the sign at the northern boundary of the site does not appear to fulfil this purpose and thereby superfluous.
5. At the southern end, a double faced angular sign is in principle reasonable to provide advance information to approaching motorists and avoid sudden braking by visitors that could cause a safety hazard. For the same reason a back of pavement location is also acceptable in this instance.
6. However, in all cases the combination of the bright colours and the size of the signs is such as to harm the visual amenity of the area and I note that several local residents share the Council's concern. I acknowledge that these are corporate colours but consider that negotiation with the Council on a revised application to achieve a better balance between the need to identify the site on the one hand and the impact on amenity on the other is feasible.

7. The appellant has referred to a couple of other signs at premises in the vicinity, but I have assessed the appeal application on its merits and the visual impact on this particular stretch of Funtley Hill which is not affected by these other signs.
8. For the reasons explained above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR