



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2021

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/Z/21/3269524

Stokesley Cricket Club, Broughton Road, Stokesley TS9 5JG

- 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 David Smith against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02282/ADV was refused by notice dated 11 January 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is retrospective application for advertisement consent for 6 hoardings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Scaled plans of the proposals were not submitted with the appeal. The appellant has subsequently submitted photographs of the site and I saw that advertisements were in place at the time of my visit. In reaching my decision I have referred to the details provided with the appeal and by the appellant, as well as observations on my visit.
3. The description of the proposed advertisements provided on the application form has been replaced by amended versions on the Council's decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that the description given on the decision notice accurately represents the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision. I have taken the address of the proposal from the application form and have had regard to the details provided by the appellant in respect of the location of the appeal site.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The advertisements are located on the boundary of Stokesley Cricket Club, which is located on the edge of the town. Despite the proximity of the cricket club to the town, due to the open landscaped nature of the site and its surroundings it is viewed within the context of the countryside setting of the town rather than the built-up area.

6. The advertisements project above the planted boundary treatment at the appeal site and are prominent features when viewed from a roundabout which serves as one of the main accesses into the town. Due to their height, design and location, the hoardings appear as incongruous and obtrusive features within this area. Even when viewed within the context of ancillary structures and other features associated with the cricket club, the hoardings introduce an unacceptable degree of clutter in views of the area.
7. The appellant emphasises that the cricket club is a charity and that the signs generate revenue which in turn supports the club in providing facilities for the community. However, based on the evidence before me, these benefits would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified in respect of the amenity of the area.
8. Reference has been made to advertisements located on roundabouts elsewhere in the area. However, there are no such advertisements on the roundabout in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, and advertisements permitted elsewhere do not establish a context for the signs which form the basis of this appeal.
9. Due to their obtrusive siting and design, I conclude that the hoardings will harm the amenity of this area. I have taken account of policies CP4 and CP17 of the Council's Core Strategy 2007 and policies DP30 and DP32 of the Development Policies 2008. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that proposals are of a high quality design which respects and enhances local context and landscape, amongst other things, and so are material to this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm the amenity of the area, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR