
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/Z/19/3236195

488 Midsummer Boulevard, Central Milton Keynes, MK9 2EA

- 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 Richard Winterbottom against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00724/ADV, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2019.
 - The advertisement was originally described as 'painting of a lady laying down covered in yellow sheets next to club logo and name'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The site is located on the side elevation of an extension that forms part of 488 Midsummer Boulevard. The structure is located next to 489-499 Avebury Boulevard and sits behind a vacant area of land. The area next to the site is predominantly car parking and retail, with the wider area mainly characterised by commercial development, including office, leisure and food and drink uses.
4. The existing signage in the area largely relates to identifying the use inside the building, and whilst clearly visible, appear subservient in the context of the buildings they are located on. I noted on my site visit an existing advertising banner that was located on part of the area for the proposed sign. There is nothing before me to determine what status this banner has, in any case, the proposed signage is significantly larger than the existing signage.
5. Due to the scale of the signage and the large area of the wall it would cover, it would appear as an obtrusive and incongruous feature. The proposal would not relate well to the existing signage within the local area and would appear as a stark and overly dominant aspect on the visual amenity of the area.
6. I note that the appellant has suggested that there is significant mature planting in the immediate locality that obscures the views towards the advertisement. The extent to which the planting might obscure some of views is very limited, as the planting does not sit directly in front of, or around the signage, and it is

spaced out along the parking area. The proposed signage would be readily visible from the adjacent footpath as the trees are located next to the parking areas, resulting in uninterrupted views of the appeal signage.

7. The appellant has also suggested that the existing structure is an eyesore and would be improved by the signage. Whilst the existing building makes little positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
8. Even taking the commercial context into account, the sign as proposed would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area and would detract from the character of the local area and the structure on which it would be located. The Council have not referred me to any policies in the development plan which they consider are breached by the proposal. However, I consider that the scheme would conflict with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that the quality and character of places does not suffer as a result of poorly sited and designed advertisements.

Other Matters

9. I note there was an objection from Central Milton Keynes Town Council on the content of the signage. However, this is not a determinative matter for this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR