
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2023

by S. Hartley BA(Hons) Dist.TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/Z/23/3320267

42 High Street, Methwold, Norfolk IP26 4NT

- 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 Serkan Araz against the decision of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01158/A, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2023.
 - The advertisement proposed is for 1 no. externally illuminated fascia sign, 2 no. poster display units, 1 no. flat panel, and 2 no sets of window vinyls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for 1 no. externally illuminated fascia sign, 2 no. poster display units, 1 no. flat panel, and 2 no sets of window vinyls at 42 High Street, Methwold, Norfolk, IP26 4NT in accordance with application ref:22/01158/A, dated 8 June 2022. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional condition:

The level of illumination of the illuminated sign shall not at any time exceed 600 cd/m². No part of the source of the illumination shall at any time be directly visible to users of the adjacent public highway.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal is made retrospectively for advertisements that have already been constructed. As the appeal is made retrospectively, it is not necessary to impose a drawings condition. However, in the interests of certainty, the appeal relates to the following submitted plans: site plan/location plan dated 31 May 2022 and signage proposal plans dated 27/07/2022 (Rev4).
3. The planning application was made by Mr Gopan Vijayan (Booker Group Ltd) whereas the appeal is submitted by Mr Serkan Araz. Mr Vijayan has confirmed in writing that he *'as the original applicant, authorise Mr Serkan Araz of 42 High Street, Methwold, Thetford IP26 4NT to conduct the appeal on my behalf and as the substitute appellant and with his knowledge that in the event of any appeal costs being awarded with regard to the appeal that he will be responsible for any such payments'*. Mr Araz has confirmed in writing his acceptance of the above statement as it applies to himself. I have therefore determined the appeal in the name of Mr Serkan Araz.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the amenity of the area including the Methwold Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The advertisements relate to a detached, white painted, two storey village shop located on Methwold High Street and within its CA.
6. The local planning authority (LPA) raises no objections on amenity grounds to any of the signs other than to the illuminated fascia because of its size in relation to the proportions of the building as distinct to any objection including illumination, colour or any other issue.
7. The fascia board is located upon the front elevation of the symmetrically designed, two-storey part of the building, between the ground floor and first floor windows and sited centrally above the entrance. Its length covers the majority of the main two-storey part of the front elevation.
8. While the LPA considers that it is disproportionally large for the building, it is well balanced in relation to the symmetry of the elevation and, in this regard, it does not detract from it.
9. Moreover, historical photographs submitted as part of the appeal show that the building has previously had such a fascia board and with comparable dimensions. On my site visit, I was also able to note a comparably large advertisement board upon the commercial building on the opposite side of the road. To some extent, the two signs complement each other and form visually a balanced approach to this part of the High Street.
10. I consider that the fascia is proportionate in its size and scale to the host building, and while there are few other comparable signs in the immediate area (apart from the one opposite) I do not consider that the appeal signage causes harm to the CA.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal proposal accords with policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) and with chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), which aim to protect and enhance the amenity value of heritage assets and the amenity of areas more generally.

Condition

12. I have imposed a condition relating to the degree of luminosity in the interests of the visual amenity of the CA.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR