



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2023 by Max Webb BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/Z/23/3317167

A148 Cromer Road, Holt (Prior to Lovell Development) NR25 6GJ [608846, 338841]

- 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 Mrs Joanne Woodward (Marketing Force Limited), against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref ADV/22/2707, dated 15 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2023.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 x static non-illuminated advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Government published on 5 September 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a relevant factor, in this instance, the issues most relevant to this advertisement appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisement) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.
6. The Planning Practice Guidance sets out that in practice, 'amenity' is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement, and the local characteristics of the

neighbourhood should always be considered. The Framework sets out that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

7. The appeal site is a grass verge located close to a roundabout. On the side of the roundabout where the advertisement is proposed, there are large trees and greenery, giving the area a verdant character with no built development visible. On the opposite side is a residential development, visible behind a bund and planting, with some temporary commercial signage related to the development in situ. The surrounding area is therefore characterised predominantly by residential properties and greenery. At the time of the site visit, I also observed some small event-related signage in the vicinity of the roundabout.
8. The size of the proposed advertisement was reduced during the application process, however it would still be in a prominent position. Although relatively low in height, a commercial advertisement of this scale in this setting would appear out of character with the greenery behind and residential properties opposite. The posts upon which the display would sit would be a dark colour, as would the reverse side of the display, meaning the advertisement would only be visible on approaching the roundabout in one direction. However, this structure would still appear out of place with the vegetation behind. The proposal would therefore harm the visual amenity of the area.
9. The signage on the opposite side of the roundabout is clearly related to the residential development being developed and there is no substantive evidence before me that it has consent to remain permanently. The appellant has provided imagery of further advertisements, however most of these are a significant distance from the appeal site and do not relate to the character of this roundabout. Other advertisements in the vicinity of the roundabout are event signage that is clearly temporary in nature, indeed some of the advertisements referenced by the appellant have since been removed. I have no substantive evidence before me that those remaining benefit from consent. These other advertisements therefore do not justify the introduction of permanent commercial signage in this location.
10. The appellant has suggested a condition that would require removal of the advertisement at any point it was not being utilised. It is unclear how a condition of this nature could be worded to be reasonable, and I have not been provided with any wording to suggest how this could be achieved. The appellant has also provided evidence that signs of a similar nature have a high occupancy rate, which suggests the advertisement is unlikely to not be utilised. In any case, the structure and display would remain sizeable and prominent, which would result in some harm to the amenity of the area.
11. Overall, the proposal would unacceptably harm the amenity of the area. Although not decisive, I have taken into account that the proposal would conflict with paragraph 8.3 of the North Norfolk Local Development Framework Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2008), which outlines how advertisements need to pay due regard to their surroundings.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has raised the potential economic benefits to the local area that could arise from the advertisement display. Nevertheless, advertisements

should only be subject to control in the interests of amenity and public safety. As such, I give these potential benefits limited weight and they do not justify the harm identified.

13. Objections have been raised regarding the effect of the advertisement on public safety, particularly with concerns around the advertisement display causing distraction near a roundabout. The sign would be low to the ground and away from key sight lines at this junction. It would be visible from some distance when approaching the roundabout, so drivers would see it in good time before having to negotiate the change from one to two lanes at the roundabout. It would also be non-illuminated, static and non-reflective, features which could be secured by planning conditions if the proposal were otherwise acceptable. I am therefore satisfied that the advertisement would not result in any undue distraction to drivers approaching this roundabout. As a result, I find no harm would arise in relation to public safety. Nevertheless, this would not mitigate or outweigh the harm I have identified to the amenity of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the reasoning set out above. The proposed advertisement would harm amenity and there are no other relevant factors or material considerations that justify granting consent. On that basis, the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR