



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/Z/24/3356513

42 High Street, Solihull, Birmingham B91 3TB

- 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 for the display of an advertisement.
 - The appeal is made by Elonex against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2024/01393/ADV.
 - The development proposed is a double-sided projecting sign (internally-illuminated) for the display of static digital advertisements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of the application the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is within a typical high street shopping area, with rows of commercial buildings either side of a pedestrianised street within the Solihull Town Centre Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
5. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
6. In assessing amenity, I have taking into account the advertisements on nearby properties. Advertisements within the area are prevalent and comprise a range of designs. I observed during my site visit that whilst hanging advertisements

are obvious within the area, none were comparable to the proposal before me in terms of scale and design.

7. The advertisement before me would be located on the front of a commercial building, projecting forward into the shopping street. Due to the elevated position, scale, illumination and static digital images the advertisement would be a prominent and intrusive addition to the area.
8. I conclude that the display of the advertisement proposed would be detrimental to the amenity of the area and would be an imposing addition to the conservation area.
9. I have taken into account Policies P15 and P16 of the Solihull Local Plan, Shaping a Sustainable Future (2013) which seek to ensure that developments conserve and enhance local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality and do not harm heritage assets. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
10. I find conflict with the Framework which seeks to protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed, and express consent is refused for double-sided projecting sign (internally-illuminated) for the display of static digital advertisements as applied for.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR