



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2022

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/Z/22/3299964

EBMC, Seaview Road, Peacehaven BN10 8PX

- 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 M Hofford (East Brighton Masonic Centre) against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref: LW/21/0969 dated 21 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The advertisement is back lit circular sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The internally illuminated sign is already in place and was in place at the time the application was made. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the internally illuminated sign on the visual amenity of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building, the East Brighton Masonic Centre (EBMC), is a large building on the west side of Seaview Road and within a predominantly residential area. The sign is on the north side of the building and I understand that it is specifically sited to be seen along Seaview Road and from the main road at the northern end, the A259.
5. The information provided indicates that the sign is a replacement, of similar size and form, to a previous sign that was on the building, but that sign was externally illuminated from above. I have noted that the reasons for the internally illuminated sign, and in particular the objective to ensure that the building can be seen from the A259 and have taken into account the previous sign. However, this is a predominantly residential area with an absence of bright illuminations, and I am firmly of the view that an internally illuminated sign of this size is inappropriate and an alien feature in a largely residential road where no others exist.
6. I have taken into account the suggested proposals to limit further the hours of illumination or the level of illumination. However, no specific information has

been provided to me regarding either proposed modification. Furthermore, and notwithstanding the absence of any further details, I am not persuaded that either of these proposals would overcome the objection in principle to an internally illuminated sign of this size in this residential location.

7. Given the size of the internally illuminated sign, the presence of a streetlight outside of a nearby property does not in my view compare. Streetlights are, in any event and in contrast to the internally illuminated sign, an expected piece of street furniture in residential roads.
8. I therefore conclude that the internally illuminated sign does detract from visual amenity. The reasons for the sign do not outweigh the harm to visual amenity which I have concluded.
9. The Council has referred to Policies DM25 and DM31 of the Lewes District Local Plan in its reasons for refusal. In so far as these relate to issues of amenity, I have taken them into account in my decision as material considerations. I consider that the proposal also conflicts with these development plan policies.
10. I agree that there is no harm to public safety and the Council raised no concerns in this regard.
11. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR