
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/Z/25/3368304

Land west of Bilsham Road, Yapton, West Sussex BN18 0LA

- 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 Tilly Whishaw (Barratt Redrow Ltd) against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is Y/17/25/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of a single 5.1m advertisement hoarding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of a single 5.1m advertisement hoarding at Land west of Bilsham Road, Yapton, West Sussex BN18 0LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref Y/17/25/A. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

Preliminary Matter

2. When the application was submitted to the Council the advertisement was in situ and so described on the application form as being retrospective. This wording is superfluous, particularly as the advertisement has now been removed. I have therefore omitted it from the description of the advertisement in my banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The Council has concluded that the advertisement would be acceptable in terms of public safety and, from the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The advertisement would be positioned on the edge of a field to the south of Bittern Avenue. It would be raised above the adjacent hedge to give it maximum visibility to users of the road and footpath
5. When viewed from the south, the advertisement would be seen against a backdrop of houses, street lamps and other suburban streetscape features. The advertisement would be noticeable but not overly prominent within that context.
6. Given the alignment of Bilsham Road, the advertisement would only be visible to those travelling south, out of Yapton, for a short period of time. For part of that

time, the advertisement would be seen against a backdrop of distant trees, with it only being seen against the sky, and therefore at its most prominent, for a short period of time. For those travelling by motor vehicle, it would be seen against the sky only fleetingly.

7. It is likely to be most evident to a small number of residents living opposite the site. The advertisement would be seen against a background of the existing field and sky, giving it prominence in views to the west. The sign would not be illuminated or animated and although sizeable would not be excessively scaled relative to the overall outlook from these properties. Once houses begin to be constructed on the site, any impact of the sign is likely to lessen.
8. I am therefore satisfied that it would not be so intrusive that it would adversely affect the amenity of these nearby occupiers. I am also mindful that the Council did not in its reason for refusal specifically identify the amenity of these residents as being directly harmed by the proposal.
9. In view of all of the above, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the amenity of the area. The Council, in their refusal reason, did not refer to any policies and so the development plan is not determinative in this appeal. However, given that I have concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to amenity, it would accord with Paragraph 141 of the Framework in this respect.

Other Matters

10. The Council is concerned that if the advertisement receives consent now it could be in place for more than the 5 years which is being sought. I understand the current application for housing development on the site is now scheduled for a decision in October 2025. A decision was initially anticipated earlier than this. If a decision were to be further delayed for an extended period then I could not entirely rule out the possibility of there needing to be an additional period of time for the advertisement to be displayed. However, at that stage the Council would be well placed to determine whether a short extension was fitting or whether the continued presence of the advertisement was no longer appropriate.
11. I am also mindful that the site has an extant permission for housing development and the Council has been discussing the current scheme with the developer for some time. As such, there is nothing before me to indicate that permission is unlikely to be forthcoming in the near future or that work on any permission would not begin in a timely manner, thereby minimising the likelihood of the advertisement needing to be in place for more than five years. Therefore, while I acknowledge the Council's concerns regarding the length of time the advertisement might be displayed, it does not at this stage lead me to rejecting the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR