



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2019

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/Z/19/3231949

38 High Street, Horley RH6 7BB

- 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 Savers Health and Beauty Limited against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00678/ADV, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2019.
 - The advertisement is 1 no. high-level signage panel with Savers logo and external illumination to rear of unit (signage height to be confirmed on site).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application for consent assessed by the Council included advertisements being erected to the front and rear of the appeal property. The Council issued a split decision whereby the fascia and projecting signs proposed to be erected at the front of the property were granted consent but a rear high level externally illuminated panel sign was not. Accordingly, this appeal has only assessed the rear illuminated advertisement as described by the appellant and which has been erected.
3. The Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) make it clear that advertisements should be the subject of control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has not objected to the appeal scheme for public safety reasons. Whilst the Council has referred to development plan policies which it considers relevant to this appeal they cannot, by themselves, be decisive but are material considerations to the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

1. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the character, appearance and amenity of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The sign is located to the rear of a building which includes the appellant's retail unit at ground floor level with residential use above. The appellant claims that the sign replaces a previous advertisement but no details have been provided about its circumstances and it was removed prior to the erection of the appeal

scheme. The appeal scheme has, therefore, been assessed on its own circumstances.

5. At the rear of the property is the servicing area for the retail unit accessed from a road which also serves other properties and a large surface level car park. The signage and advertisements to the rear of these properties generally comprise a mix of different types and sizes of signs. Some of these advertisements are illuminated by varying methods.
6. However, the advertisements associated with commercial use of these other properties are generally at ground floor level rather than being elevated to the same degree as the appeal scheme. The appeal scheme is at third storey level. There are advertisement hoardings adjacent to the railway and fascia signs associated with a former railway building to the east of Consort Way East but these are also at a lower level.
7. By reason of elevation and its predominantly white colour attached to a dark brick background, the advertisement is a noticeable and prominent feature from adjacent the car park and road. The advertisement's siting is not well related to either the ground floor retail unit or the siting of other signs within the surrounding area. It is an incongruous feature in this location and its visual prominence would be accentuated when illuminated.
8. The appellant claims the sign is required to assist with directing service vehicles to the rear of the property. However, other commercial businesses with rear access have signs for deliveries and parking at a lower level.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed because the advertisement causes unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and amenity of the surrounding area and, as such, conflicts with Sh2 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan concerning advertisements being designed to respect the entire elevation of the building of which they form part and to be complementary to the street scene in general.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR