



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2022

**by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 17<sup>th</sup> November 2022**

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/Z/22/3306817**

**Advertising hoardings at junction of Tynemouth Road & Tanners Bank, North Shields, Tyne & Wear NE30 4AA**

- 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 Global against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
- The application Ref 22/00894/ADV, dated 25 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2022.
- The advertisement proposed is 3 x Non-illuminated 48 sheet poster panels.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Background and Main Issue

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) all make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. The reasons for refusal refer to North Tyneside Local Plan policy DM6.3. I have taken this policy into account insofar as it relates to matters of amenity.
3. The Council have not objected to the proposal on grounds of public safety, nor have I been presented with any further compelling evidence to lead me to reach an alternative conclusion. Thus, the main issue in this instance is the effect of the proposal upon amenity.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a prominent roadside position on a railway (Tyne & Wear Metro) embankment wall on the southern side of Tynemouth Road, close to its junction with Tanners' Bank. The site lies in a prominent roadside location on Tynemouth Road, opposite two 'Local Register' buildings<sup>1</sup>. The site also lies between the Tynemouth Village and Fish Quay Conservation Areas, the boundaries of which are to the north and south of the site, respectively.
5. The appeal site has, over the years, accommodated both a grouping of three 48-sheet poster panels and more recently a single 48-sheet poster panel. At the time of my visit three poster panels were in place but not displaying advertisements. On the opposite side of the junction is a single 48-sheet poster panel.

<sup>1</sup> Tynemouth Lodge Hotel and 28 Tynemouth Road

6. Each poster panel within the appeal scheme comprises of a 'standard 48-sheet' display measuring approximately 3 metres in height and 6 metres in width. Thus, with small spacing gaps between each panel, the display would extend for over 18 metres along the face of the stone embankment wall.
7. Although the appellant describes the panels as fitting neatly on the wall and in scale with it, I consider neither statement to accurately reflect the advertisements in this case. Each panel would extend comfortably above the rounded coping stones that run along the top of the wall, thereby disrupting a distinctive feature of this stretch of embankment wall. Nor, given the embankment wall's slightly concave face, would they sit particularly comfortably or neatly against its face. They may sit parallel to the road and thus their faces may not be particularly prominent on approach from either direction, but this would not negate their jarring and awkward relationship with the embankment wall, or their cumulative scale and visual impact when viewed closer up, where they would have an intimate and somewhat overpowering visual relationship with pedestrians.
8. Taking these factors together, I am not persuaded that the panels are the neatly unobtrusive panels the appellant claims them to be. It may be that poster panels are not unexpected features in a railway or transport-related setting, particularly given the history of panels at this location. I also accept that the presence of a further poster panel on the opposite side of the junction plays a part in context setting. However, that is a single panel, whereas the appeal proposal is for three panels, and does not provide comparable context.
9. Furthermore, the area's immediate character is defined more by the lengthy stone wall and vegetated embankment above it, than the presence of the rail lines behind it or a single poster panel on the opposite side of the junction. The appeal panels would instead have a jarring and disruptive presence on the stone embankment wall and introduce a sense of commercial clutter largely absent from this part of Tynemouth Road, or that of the busier commercial setting of the Fish Quay further down Tanners' Bank. The advertisements would, I conclude, be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and thus harmful to amenity.
10. North Tyneside Local Plan policy DM6.3 states that advertisements must be appropriate to their local settings in terms of, amongst other things, location, scale and design. Proposals will be permitted, it goes on to state, where they do not have a detrimental impact, either individually or cumulatively, on a range of factors including visual amenity and character. I have taken into account Local Plan policy DM6.3, the provisions of which are material but not determinative in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would cause harm to amenity, the proposal would also be in conflict with the provisions of this policy.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Robbie*

INSPECTOR