



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2023 by Ms S Maur MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/Z/23/3325743

River View Lodge, 7-11 Manygates Lane , Shepperton TW17 9EQ

- 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 Churchill Retirement Living Ltd against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00494/ADV.
 - The advertisements proposed are 1 x Monolith, 2 x flags, 2 x Hanging Signs; various banners/boards.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published on 19 December 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 Council has no objection to the proposal on the grounds of public safety. From the evidence before me, and from my observations, I have no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on amenity.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site contains a recently built complex of retirement accommodation in a residential street. Temporary consent was sought for display of several advertisements in 2019. The Council issued a split decision, with consent granted for some of the advertisements until 1 March 2021, and the other advertisements were refused consent. The evidence before me indicates that more advertisements were displayed than had consent, and that the temporary period was exceeded.

6. A temporary consent is now sought for a number of advertisements. Evidence from the Council and interested parties indicates that the signage was still in place at the time the Council considered the proposal now subject to this appeal. At the time of my site visit these had been removed however, and there were only 'For Sale' signs along the front boundary and the name of the development on the building itself. Therefore, I have dealt with the appeal on this basis. Consent is sought for one year or until the last apartment is sold, whichever is the sooner.
7. The proposal includes numerous advertisements of different size, height and nature. The smaller signs along the path to the sales office would have limited visual impact, as they would be located close to a tall brick wall and behind a hedge and railings. The flags would however be tall and large features, prominent in this street scene. Several monoliths and railing banners area proposed, each of which would be large and clearly visible. These larger signs would be arranged and seen in succession along the front boundary, resulting in significant and harmful visual clutter.
8. Overall, therefore, although they would not be illuminated and would have a subdued colour palette, the number, size and scale of the advertisements proposed would make them an unduly prominent and dominant feature in the street scene. The cumulative impact of the proposal would therefore harm amenity in this residential area where advertisements are not part of the character of the area. I appreciate the appellant's desire to advertise the remaining units on the site, however this does not justify the harm that would result from the amount of signage proposed.
9. This harm would be reduced by the temporary period sought, but would nevertheless endure for the duration of the consent. Therefore, a temporary consent would not adequately mitigate the harm to amenity.
10. Consequently, the proposal would harm amenity and would therefore conflict with the Framework, which sets out that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and I agree with the reasoning. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR