

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by **SE Hughes BA (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 07 March 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/Z/24/3352417**

**Bournemouth Sign Co, Unit 6, Christchurch Business Park, Radar Way,  
Christchurch, BH23 4FL**

- 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 Richard Morris of Morris SOT Ltd ta Bournemouth Sign Co against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
  - The application Ref is 8/24/0337/ADV.
  - The advertisement proposed is a large aluminium advertising panel secured to the roadside of industrial unit.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. I have used the address on the appeal form as it provides the company name and unit number of the address.
4. The Council revised the description of development and refer to “retrospective” but this is not a form of development and the evidence that I have before me does not provide details of the appellant’s agreement to change the development description. Therefore, I have used the description of development provided on the application form, albeit I have removed the word “our”, which is superfluous.
5. During my site visit I was able to see that the advertisement is already in place. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

### Main Issue

6. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirm that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety.
7. The Council raise no concerns in relation to public safety and based on the evidence before me, and my site visit, I see no reason to take a different view.

8. The main issue is, therefore, the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

### **Reasons**

9. The advertisement, measuring 4.4m in width and 1.76m in height has been positioned 4.8m above ground level on the plain rear façade of an industrial building which forms part of Christchurch Business Park, an inward facing complex of industrial units, situated off Radar Way. The building backs onto The Runway, a distributor road which separates the industrial estate from a residential estate, accessed opposite via Wellesley Avenue. Trees and shrubs planted along The Runway partially screen the advertisement.
10. On the winter's day of my site visit the advertisement was highly visible through the bare branches of the trees when approaching it from Wellesley Avenue. The sign is also visible, as a brief side view, when driving past along The Runway, but it is more obvious to pedestrians using the footpath. Due to the advertisement's large size and its elevated position, on the rear of the building, the advertisement appears out of place and as though it has been put up as an afterthought. As such, the presence of the advertisement is visually jarring.
11. My attention has been specifically drawn to a neighbouring advertisement on the side elevation of unit 7 which uses red and green lettering and motifs against a white background. As a consequence, this sign is more prominent than the more subtle colour palette featured by the appeal sign which uses a dark blue background with white lettering. On my site visit I also noted that on the rear of the nearby unit 4, there was a further, small orange sign with white lettering.
12. I have not been provided with the planning history of the advertisement for unit 7, nor do I have any such details for the one for unit 4, however, by virtue of their significantly smaller size, I found both signs to be far less prominent than the appeal sign, despite their brighter colours. In addition, the sign for unit 7 is orientated differently to the appeal sign. Consequently, it has a much lesser impact on the street scene and is completely hidden from view from Wellesley Avenue. As such, and because each application must be determined on its own merits, I do not consider the existing advertisements for units 7 and 4, to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
13. I appreciate that the PPG states that a large poster-hoarding might be permitted in an industrial or commercial area. Also, that there are other advertisements associated with business premises along The Runway, however, those advertisements differ to the appeal sign as they are commonly positioned on the buildings public edge. Furthermore, they are not directly visible from the long views that the appeal sign is, from Wellesley Avenue.
14. It is stated that the advertisement is in an area which has no important scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features, and reference has been made to the Christchurch Borough Wide Character Assessment's finding that the site is within an area which has no sense of place and no strong landscape character. Nevertheless, this does not alter my assessment that the advertisement would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area.

15. Taking all these matters into account, and based on my observations at my site visit, I find the advertisement to be a visually intrusive feature in the street scene which has a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area.
16. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are relevant. Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy seeks good design which is compatible with its surroundings and so is material in this case.
17. I have concluded that the advertisement has a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area, and therefore the appeal proposal conflicts with Policy HE2. For the same reason, the proposal would also be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 141 of the Framework which states, amongst other things, that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited.

### **Other Matters**

18. I also note the appellant's comments in respect of the Framework, regarding the need to support the economic growth of businesses. However, as the only factors that a decision maker can take into account when determining an advertisement application or appeal are amenity and public safety, this does not materially affect my consideration of the appeal proposal.

### **Conclusion**

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the advertisement has a harmful effect on amenity and the appeal should be dismissed.

*SE Hughes*

INSPECTOR