The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/Z/21/3274567
Jubilee Caravans, Ashington, NE63 8UB

- 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 Anjam Mahmood against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
- The application Ref 21/00574/ADE, dated 15 February 2021, was part approved and part refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
- The advertisements proposed are described as 'Informational – fence fixed x 2 hoarding x 1'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Anjam Mahmood against Northumberland County Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council issued a split decision in relation to the three advertisements which were the subject of the original application. That refused relates to Advertisement 1, a 4m x 2m sign, which would be placed 2.4m above ground level at the northern end of the site. I will only deal with the advertisement that has been refused. At the time of my site visit this advertisement was not in place at the site.

4. The parties have drawn my attention to Local Plan Policy they consider to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken it into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

6. The advertisement would be located at the northern end of the site and would be prominent by reason of its large size and height above ground level, close to

the vehicular entrance of the adjacent Co-Op retail store. I noted the presence of existing signage clearly visible when approaching from both directions along Remscheid Way supporting the business at the entrance to the site close to its southern boundary.

7. Whilst large advertisements, often positioned at height, are a common sight further south within the industrial estate that borders Remscheid Way, this is not the case at the northern end of the appeal site. This part of the site is towards the northern end of the road where the character differs significantly.

8. This part of Remscheid Way is only a short distance from housing to the north and has a less commercial character. Hedges line both sides of the street and more restrained signage, including that at the Co-Op and caravan store is in evidence.

9. I accept that the advertisement would be set back from the edge of the road, would be positioned above the boundary fencing, would not be illuminated and that some advertisement is essential to commercial activities.

10. However, such a large advertisement positioned at height would be highly prominent and would have a rather garish appearance, which would be very much out of character with this part of the road, the character of which differs significantly from Remscheid Way further to the south at the entrance to the site and beyond.

11. The advertisement would therefore by reason of its siting and scale have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area.

12. Whilst various Policies within the Wansbeck District Local Plan (2007) (WDLP) have been put before me, that which is most relevant is Policy RTC11 which directly relates to outdoor advertisements. The proposal would conflict with this Policy which requires that amongst other things the character or appearance of an area will not be adversely affected by advertisements.

13. There is nothing within policies GP30, GP31 or EMP1 of the WDLP which are respectively concerned with the visual impact of development, urban design and general employment land and business parks which would lead me to come to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR