



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/Z/23/3331193

A1243 Pasteur Road, Great Yarmouth NR31 0LZ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Joanne Woodward (Marketing Force Limited) against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 06/23/0159/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of 1 x static non-illuminated advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons

3. The proposed advertisement would be located on a grass verge adjacent to Pasteur Road, a dual carriageway which dissects areas mainly in commercial and retail use. There are two totem style signs in the vicinity related to the nearby supermarket and retail park, along with signage on the buildings and four small advertisements on the nearby roundabout. In more distant views there is a further retail area where advertisements are present, some of which are visible from this part of Pasteur Road. However, notwithstanding the presence of the existing signs, the area closest to the appeal site has a spacious and uncluttered appearance, absent of roadside advertisements and well landscaped.
4. The display would be substantial in size, with a maximum height of approximately 2 metres above the ground and with a width of approximately 2.4 metres. It would stand as an isolated advertisement in the street scene in views taken towards the A47, physically separate from the built commercial and retail developments in the area. Indeed, it would have no association with them visually in terms of its location. Due to its large size and its positioning, it would be a dominant feature, and one that would appear visually discordant given the current spaciousness of the uncluttered highway verge and its immediate surroundings. This would result in harm to amenity.
5. The presence of the existing landscaping in the backdrop of the proposed advertisement would not overcome the visual harm that it would cause, nor would the use of black posts and a black back to the advertisement. The fact

that it is intended that the sign would be well maintained also does not overcome this harm. I acknowledge that the proposal would not be located in a conservation area or in a residential area, but nonetheless it remains that I have found that harm to amenity would result.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to amenity due to its size and positioning. I have taken into account Policy CS09 of the Core Strategy 2015 and Policy A3 of the Local Plan Part 2 2021 which seek to protect amenity, and so are material in this case, together with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, it conflicts with these policies.

Other Matters

7. Reference is made to the economic benefits that the proposed sign could help promote, that the format proposed is attractive due to its relative affordability and that demand exists for such signage. These benefits align with some of the key economic objectives set out in the development plan. There would also be minimal physical impacts on the grass verge and surrounding vegetation and to biodiversity. However, I can only base my judgement on the effect that the proposal would have on the interests of amenity.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR