



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2022

by C Harding BA(Hons) PGDipTRP PGCert MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/Z/22/3301206

Old Railway Station Yard, Station Lane, Ketteringham, Norfolk NR9 3AZ

- 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 Nathan Riches against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0377, dated 21 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is display board on trailer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of the display board on trailer as applied for. The consent is for four years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council considered the application on a retrospective basis, and it was evident that the proposed trailer-mounted display board was already located on the site at the time of my site visit. Accordingly, and as there does not appear to be any dispute as to the nature of the appeal proposal, I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The application form indicates that the period for which consent is sought is four years, as opposed to the five years set out at Regulation 14(7)(b), and my decision reflects this accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement upon the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises open ground between the A11 dual-carriageway and a railway line, and adjacent to the junction of the A11 with Station Lane. Some distance to the south-east of the appeal site is an area of commercial development, including two of the businesses referenced on the proposed advertisement. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by agricultural land interspersed with mature hedgerows and areas of woodland.
6. The advertisement is located such that it is visible, at closest proximity, to traffic heading towards Wymondham on the A11. From this direction the advertisement is, on approach, seen behind road signage associated with the

exit slip road. Furthermore, due to the gentle curvature of the road and its location set back from the main carriageway, due to the entry and exit slip roads, it is not prominent in longer distance views.

7. It is visible at longer distances when viewed from the opposite direction, heading towards Norwich on the A11, however these views are oblique and across the opposite carriageway and any intervening traffic. Furthermore, due to the presence of mature roadside planting, the proposal is only visible intermittently, reducing its prominence in longer views.
8. When the appeal site is approached from the south along Station Lane, the advertisement is largely screened by mature trees and undergrowth on the western side of the road, and the concrete parapet of the bridge over the railway obscures the advertisement further, almost until it is reached.
9. From public viewpoints in the surrounding countryside, the advertisement is generally viewed in the distance, and in the context of the busy road adjacent to which it is located. Set against this background, where the advertisement is visible, it appears small, and the eye is instead drawn to the moving traffic. Overall, the effect of the proposal in terms of the amenity of the wider area is limited.
10. Close proximity views of the advertisement are possible from all directions, and the advertisement is large and prominent in those views. However, in this location alongside a busy major road, such views are fleeting when experienced from a moving vehicle. Users of the shared-use path alongside the A11 would also experience the advertisement, however as this path is located immediately adjacent to mature landscaping the advertisement is obscured for much of the approach towards it reducing its effect.
11. Consequently, although the advertisement is large and is not a purpose designed advertisement, it is only prominent at relatively close proximity, when the duration of such views is likely to be limited in most cases due to the speed of traffic.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the effect of the advertisement does not harm the amenity of the area. I have taken into account Policies DM3.8m DM3.9 and DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015, and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2014 which seek to protect amenity, and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal does not harm amenity, it does not conflict with these policies.

Other Matters

13. The issue of highway safety has been raised as matter of concern by a party in representations. However, neither the Council nor National Highways have raised concerns in this regard, and I have not been presented with any evidence that would lead me to reach a different conclusion.
14. The appeal site lies within an Area of Special Control for Advertisements. As the proposed advertisement is directional, Regulation 21(2)(b) requires me to consider whether it is reasonably required.
15. The advertisement provides directional signage for two businesses located to the south of the A11, and to a further business located to the north of the A11.

These businesses are not prominently visible when approached on the A11 and are remote from any settlement. Consequently, I consider that an element of directional signage to serve these businesses would be reasonable in order to aid wayfinding from the main road.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out in the regulations.

C Harding

INSPECTOR