



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by N Holdsworth MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/Z/19/3237674

65A Southchurch Road, Southend-on-Sea, SS1 2NL

- 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 Rifat Buta against the decision of Southend-on-sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00769/ADV, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019
 - The advertisement proposed is Ocean residential banner at the rear of 65 Southchurch Road SS1 2NL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisement as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Reasons

2. The proposed advertisement banner would be located on the rear elevation of the host property. It forms part of a group of buildings which front on to Southchurch Road. It would primarily be visible from a service road, and a large car park found to the rear of the site.
3. The existing rear elevation of this group of buildings exhibits little architectural uniformity, with a variety of building styles and designs. It has a cluttered appearance typical of the rear of commercial properties, including air conditioning units, fencing, various temporary buildings, bins and parked cars at ground floor level. There are examples of existing signage within this elevation visible to the rear of the site, although these appeared to be associated with activities being carried out within the buildings themselves.
4. The banner would be fixed to an existing blank gable wall. It would not obstruct any architectural features on the host building and would be proportionate to the size of the wall upon which it would be housed. As such, it would blend in to its surroundings and would not appear as an unduly prominent feature, despite its raised position. Given the existing appearance of the rear elevation of this group of buildings, as described above, the proposal would not unacceptably add to the degree of visual clutter. There would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area.
5. Overall there would be no harm to amenity. I have taken into account policies KP1, KP2 and CP4 of the Southend on Sea Core Strategy Development Plan

Document (2007), together with Policy DM1 of the Southend on Sea Core Strategy Development Management Document (2015) which seek, amongst other things, to achieve a good standard of design that protects amenity and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies. The proposal also complies with the guidance set out in the Southend on Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) Supplementary Planning Document, which, amongst other things, requires that signage is related to the buildings proportions and is not over dominant.

6. In other respects, the Council agree that there would be no harm to public safety, and I concur with this view. Any future proposals for advertisements in the surrounding area would be considered on a case by case basis. The proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that advertisements are appropriately sited and designed.

Conclusion

7. The proposed advertisement is acceptable in terms of its effect on amenity and public safety. The appeal should be allowed.

Neil Holdsworth

INSPECTOR