



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/Z/18/3213253

348 - 350 Shirley Road, Southampton SO15 3HY

- 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. Paul Finnegan (Vans Direct) against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01862/ADV, dated 25 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2018.
 - The advertisements proposed are for 2x externally illuminated fascia signs placed on single storey elevation of 350 Shirley Road and 1x externally illuminated hoarding sign placed at 348 Shirley Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Subsequent to the submission of this appeal, the appellant has confirmed the intention to withdraw from consideration, the two fascia signs relating to No 350 Shirley Road. However, the hoarding at No 348 Shirley Road remains for consideration as part of the appeal. For the avoidance of doubt, my consideration relates only to the hoarding sign at No 348.
3. The hoarding sign at No 348 has already been erected, therefore I have determined the appeal on the basis that the appellant is seeking consent for what is now in place. The hoarding on site is consistent with what is shown on the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a car sales premises fronting Shirley Road and with a secondary frontage onto Beatrice Road. Shirley Road is a busy city street that is characterised by two and three storey buildings on either side of the road fronting onto a wide pavement area. At ground floor level, uses are predominantly retail and commercial, including shops, restaurants and pubs/bars. Signage is generally confined to projecting and fascia signs. The appeal property has a narrow frontage onto Shirley Road and primarily consists of a forecourt area for the display and sale of motor vehicles. Set back from Shirley Road and to the rear of the site are a portable sales building and detached single storey garage used for repair of vehicles. The advertisement hoarding to be retained abuts the single storey garage building referred to.

6. With dimensions of 4.3m in height by 10.9m in width, the hoarding covers the entire side elevation of the garage where it faces the vehicle display area. The hoarding's height is such that it rises above the eaves of the garage building. When viewed from Beatrice Road, the hoarding with its rectangular profile appears jarring against the simple form of the garage with its pitched roof and painted brick exterior walls. Consequently, it is out of scale with the building and appears as an overly dominant and intrusive feature in relation to it. This is not mitigated by the modern finish of the material used for the hoarding and the large lettering at the top half of the sign.
7. I note the appellant's argument that the appeal hoarding screens what is considered a poor quality building, however, I do not consider that this justifies a hoarding of the scale to be retained, as there could be other solutions to overcome this visual concern.
8. I have taken the commercial character of the area into account, where I mainly saw fascia and projecting signs on building frontages. The appeal hoarding is significantly larger than these and noticeably out of keeping in terms of scale when viewed from Shirley Road and Beatrice Road. It is also in close proximity to residential dwellings, particularly the block of flats at Basing House, where it is at a right angle to the building and viewed obliquely from its windows. Whilst I do not consider that the appeal hoarding will appear harmful when viewed from within the building, I noted that it is located close to the access to the flats and I consider it will appear visually dominant and incongruous to residents entering and leaving the property.
9. The appeal hoarding is located behind the grade II listed No 350 Shirley Road and will be seen together from a number of vantage points. However, the area between the sign and No 350 is used for the display of motor vehicles in connection with the appeal premises, whilst other commercial buildings and associated signage are also located close to No 350. Consequently, I consider that the appeal proposal would not adversely affect its setting and will therefore comply with Policy HE3 of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2nd Revision 2015) (the CSLPR).
10. I have found that the appeal hoarding will not harm the setting of the adjacent listed building. However, this is outweighed by the harmful effect on amenity. As such, it would conflict with Policies SDP1 and SDP24 of the CSLPR and CS13 of the Southampton Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Amended 2015). These policies seek amongst other considerations to impact positively on amenity and to permit proposals where scale, size and design respects the character and appearance of buildings and the area and so are material in this case.
11. My attention has been brought to other appeals submitted in respect of No 350 Shirley Road that are yet to be determined¹. These other appeals have had no bearing on my separate consideration of this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/D1780/W/18/3215732 and APP/D1780/C/19/32223231