



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/Z/20/3259510
101 Poole Road, Bournemouth BH4 9BB

- 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 Hidden Hearing Ltd against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2020-9409-K, dated 11 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
 - The advertisements are new halo illuminated aluminium fascia sign above shop front and new edge illuminated projecting sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for new halo illuminated aluminium fascia sign above shop front and new edge illuminated projecting sign, 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the application was made retrospectively, the advertisements were in position at the time of the appeal site visit.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is located within the Westbourne Conservation Area (CA). In determining the appeal it is therefore necessary to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The southern part of the CA is largely residential. The character of the northern part, within which the appeal site is located, is mainly defined by a compact shopping area, of the late Victorian to Edwardian period. Despite the historic character of the buildings largely being retained at first floor level and above, many have modern ground floor shop fronts, including the appeal site. Furthermore, there is a wide variation in the design and materials of the shop front signage surrounding the appeal site.
5. While modern materials of aluminium and perspex are used in the appeal fascia sign, the former involves overlaid panels which are powder coated either white or grey, thereby providing a smooth painted finish in a subtle palette. The

perspex relates to the outer attached lettering and an apostrophe symbol which only cover a relatively small part of the overall fascia. In the context of the wide variation in the surrounding signage, the materials and their application do not appear conspicuous.

6. The overlaying of the panels and the lettering results in the sign having a three-dimensional appearance. While it projects beyond the fascia sign of the unit found to the west, it does not appear unduly strident in this regard, particularly as it is the limited coverage of the lettering which projects the greatest. Similarly, although the small projecting sign is bulkier than that found to the west, it is comparable to many others in the wider street scene. Overall, it is considered the materials and design of the signage suitably respects the shop front and its surroundings.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded the advertisements do not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area and they also preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
8. Policies CS39 and CS41 of the Council's 2012 Core Strategy have been taken into account which respectively seek to ensure the significance of heritage assets are not adversely affected and the achievement of high quality design which respects a site and its surroundings. Accordingly, they are material in this case. Given it is concluded the proposal would not harm visual amenity, the adverts do not conflict with those policies. Furthermore, they do not conflict with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework which emphasises that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
9. The appeal is therefore allowed.

C J Ford

PLANNING DECISION OFFICER