



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/Z/24/3350149

3 Elsdon Road, Gosforth, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 1HY

- 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 Mr Peter Dawson, Mahmood & Ashraf Property Services Ltd against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0928/01/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is display of 2no non-illuminated sheet advertisement panels.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The Council have referenced development plan policies it considers relevant to this appeal, and I have taken these into account where they are material. However, powers under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 to control advertisements, may only be exercised in the interests of visual amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. Consequently, the Council's policies have not by themselves been decisive in my consideration of this appeal.
5. The appeal site is on the periphery of the commercial centre of Gosforth in a location which is characterised by buildings of a variety of ages and styles. Due to its location adjacent to Salters Road, the appeal site is highly visible, and commands views throughout the public realm. It is a converted residential terraced property containing a commercial unit to the ground floor. The building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area of Gosforth as part of the wider terrace on Elsdon Road.
6. The scheme proposes the installation of a non-illuminated fascia sign to the first-floor level of the appeal building facing onto Elsdon Road. The proposal

would be large in width and would occupy a large portion of the front elevation at first floor level. As a result, it would be excessive in size in relation to the modest proportions of the building and particularly the sash windows which it would dominate. This would result in the introduction of unacceptable visual clutter to the first floor level.

7. On the rear offshoot of the appeal building facing onto Salters Road, a similar sign is proposed. The sign would be in a highly visible location and, whilst located to the rear, would detract from the appeal building's simple form and design due to its large proportions. Taking both the elements of signage into account, the character and appearance of the building would essentially be subsumed by corporate branding, eroding the ability to appreciate the building as part of the wider terrace. Furthermore, the introduction of signage at the appeal site would break the unaltered rhythm at first floor level of the terraced properties on Elsdon Road which makes a positive contribution to the area's character and appearance.
8. The appellant argues that the appeal site is viewed as part of Gosforth's commercial 'hub' regardless of the plan designation. I see no reason to disagree with this view that the appeal site is viewed in tandem with the other commercial units in the surrounding streets. Nonetheless, I observed on my site visit that advertisement signs at first floor level are limited with none present on the row of nearby commercial units on Salters Road. There are various signs sited on Gosforth Palace opposite the appeal site. However, that building is of a differing scale, massing and design when compared to the appeal building and the terrace it forms part of. I also acknowledge the presence of the first-floor signs sited next door at 2 Elsdon Road for the Insurance Brokers. However, the Council has outlined that these other signs do not appear to have been granted advertisement consent and I do not consider these to set a precedent.
9. The appellant has highlighted various other examples of first floor signage in the wider area. The other signage highlighted by the appellant, such as at the Victoria Hotel, is in a different location with a different character to the appeal building's immediate setting. Furthermore, I am satisfied that first floor signage to the terraced units is not a defining feature of the character of the area.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm amenity. Therefore, the proposal would also not accord with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle Upon Tyne 2010-2030 (2015), Policy DM20 of the Newcastle Upon Tyne Development and Allocation Plan 2015-2030 (2020) and Paragraph 141 of the Framework which all seek to amongst other things protect the quality and character of places in regard to the installation of advertisements.

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.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR