



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019 by Hannah Ellison MSc BSc (Hons)

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/Z/19/3229389

Dental Surgery 147 Liverpool Road, Southport, PR8 4NT

- 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 Lee Crossland against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2019/00195, dated 24 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of 2 fascia signs, 4 hanging signs and 1 hoarding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council issued a split decision on the application Ref DC/2019/00195, granting consent for the two fascia signs, and refusing consent for the hanging signs and hoarding. The fascia signs have both been installed. These advertisements are not subject to this appeal.
4. At the time of site visit the hoarding, which the Council refer to as a board sign, to the front car park area was already in place. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

6. The Council have drawn my attention to a policy they consider to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken it into account where relevant. However, powers under the Regulations¹ to control advertisements may be exercised only in the

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended)

interest of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterates this approach.

7. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, red brick property currently in use as a medical clinic. The immediate area is predominantly residential and comprises large two and three-storey villas set back from the highway behind driveways and soft landscaping.
8. The board advertisement is located in the north-west corner of the front car park. It is at a right angle to the building and road. Whilst it is non-illuminated, due to its size and positioning the advertisement is highly visible from some distance away on the approach to the site along Liverpool Road. As such, the board advertisement is a prominent addition to the street and is disproportionately large and visually intrusive to the residential character of the area. In addition, located in close proximity to an existing bus shelter, it creates a sense of visual clutter in the street scene.
9. The four hanging signs, or banner advertisements as they are described by the Council, would be positioned on the front elevation between the three first floor windows. The host building is an attractive red brick villa with a traditional fenestration pattern and detailing. The proposed advertisements would add to the number of signs already at the premises and due to their size, number and high-level positioning would result in a cluttered proliferation of signage. As such, they would have an adverse effect on the visual appearance of the property. It is noted these signs would also be non-illuminated, however this does not detract from the harm identified.
10. It is recognised there are examples of various advertisements nearby, including those referenced by the appellant. However, these are located further south along Liverpool Road in neighbourhood parades of shops and other commercial services where advertisements are not uncommon. In contrast, this proposal is surrounded by residential properties and thus the proposed advertisements would be out of keeping with the visual appearance of the area.
11. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the area. In that respect the proposal is contrary to policy EQ11 of the Local Plan for Sefton, adopted April 2017, which although not decisive, seeks to ensure advertisements respect the design and appearance of the building and the scale of the immediate surroundings.

Other Matters

12. It is stated the proposed advertisements are required to attract new clients to the business. However, the site is located on a relatively busy through road and the building is highly visible from the highway. Furthermore, the existing fascia and porch advertisements are prominent and clearly denote the use of the property to passers-by. As such, I am not persuaded that the additional proposed advertisements are required to attract customers and thus this argument carries little weight.
13. I have noted the appellant's request for advice in the event of the appeal being dismissed. However, this is a matter for the Council as the Local Planning Authority.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR