



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/Z/24/3353320

134 -140 Boothferry Road, Goole DN14 6AG

- 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 A Jumha (Euro Foods (Goole) Ltd) against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01850/PAD.
 - The advertisement proposed is display of illuminated sign on flat roof
-

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 Since the determination of the application the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework).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.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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

4. Paragraph 141 of the Framework states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account cumulative impacts. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 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.

6. The appeal building is situated within the commercial centre of Goole on Boothferry road a main shopping thoroughfare within the town in a location which is characterised by buildings of a variety of ages and styles. Due to its location opposite Jackson Street, the appeal building is highly visible, and commands views to several distant views in a prominent location. The building is single storey with a pitched roof and flat roof canopy to the front facing onto Boothferry Road.
7. The scheme proposes the installation of an illuminated sign that is to be mounted on top of the flat canopy roof and occupy the full width of the appeal building. As a result, it would be excessive in size in relation to the modest single storey form of the building resulting in a dominant feature that would create a building that would be top-heavy. This would result in the introduction of unacceptable visual clutter to the roof level. The sign would be in a highly visible location and, would detract from the appeal building's simple form and design due to its large proportions. The existing character and appearance of the building would essentially be subsumed by corporate branding, eroding the ability to appreciate the existing building's simple form.
8. Furthermore, whilst other fascia signage is present on surrounding commercial units, these maintain a consistent height in their siting. Whereas the signage to the appeal site would be an anomalous feature through its raised height and forward projection in comparison to the surrounding signs. The appellant has highlighted other signage in the area and made particular note to that at 'Big Bites'. However, that signage appears to be within the shop fascia of a two-storey building and is therefore fundamentally different to that proposed.
9. The appellant has also referenced previous signage present at the appeal site. However, this has since been removed. As such, this offers only limited weight in favour of the current proposal which must be considered in light of current guidance and the existing context of the street. Also, the appellant informs that the proposal would allow for improved access into the building but has failed to adequately explain why the proposed sign is required to achieve this.
10. As such, the proposal would conflict with paragraphs 135 and 141 of the Framework. These require proposals to be sympathetic to the character of the local area and to consider the effect of advertisements on amenity. In accordance with the Regulations, I have also considered the development plan so far as it is material. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy Env1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which 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.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR