



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1750/Z/19/3243909

101 Ash Road, Aldershot GU12 4BZ

- 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 Mrs Preeti Behroozkafshdooz against the decision of Rushmoor Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00606/ADVPP, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is a non-illuminated advertising billboard measuring 6m x 2m on side wall of 101 Ash Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 101 is a two storey, end of terrace, property located on the corner of Ash Road and Institute Road. It comprises a ground floor house clearance shop with residential accommodation on the floor above. Although there are nearby ground floor commercial uses, this particular part of the street is mainly characterised by terraced dwellings. This gives it a residential character.
4. The proposed advert would be non-illuminated and would be positioned at the first floor of the gable end of No 101. Powers to regulate advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety.
5. I appreciate that the proposal would be positioned on a blank first floor side elevation and would be a stand-alone advertisement. However, its width would be considerable. Overall, the sign would cover a significant proportion of the first floor gable end of No 101. In my view, a sign of this size would represent an overly large feature that would unduly dominate the simple and traditional first floor side elevation of the host property. Moreover, the size of the sign would emphasize its commercial nature, which would appear out of character in this predominately residential section of Ash Road.
6. The street sign for Institute Road could be relocated and the non-illuminated nature of the advert could be suitably managed through the imposition of an appropriately worded condition. Nonetheless, taking all of the above into account, I am not persuaded that the proposal would add colour and vibrancy

to the streetscene. On the contrary, it would add an inappropriate feature that would fail to integrate effectively with the character of the host property and this part of Ash Road.

7. My attention has been drawn to a similar advertisement on the side elevation of No 149 Ash Road. However, this property is opposite to a row of shops and is close to other commercial premises. These include a petrol filling station, a motor vehicle servicing and repairs centre and a Sainsbury's local supermarket. Consequently, the area in which this particular sign is positioned is considerably more commercial in character than the part of the street in which the appeal site is located. I therefore find that the sign at No 149 is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which I have assessed on its own merits in any event.
8. The Council do not object on public safety grounds and I see no reason to conclude otherwise on this matter. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, I find that the proposal would be harmful to visual amenity. In its decision notice the Council has referred to Policy DE9 of the Rushmoor Local Plan. Amongst other things, this seeks to ensure that advertisements do not cause harm to the character of the area. I have taken into account this relevant policy, which is material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, it would conflict with this policy. I also find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it recognises that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion

9. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be detrimental to amenity. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR