
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/Z/25/3370293

99 Bikes, Unit B, Auckland House, New Zealand Avenue, Walton on Thames, Surrey, KT12 1PL

- 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 99 Bikes Limited against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 2025/1039.
 - The advertisement is described as “Advertisement Consent: 1 internally illuminated fascia sign, 1 internally illuminated projecting sign and window sign panels to cover 2 no. ground floor windows”.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) all clarify that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The reasons for refusal refer to Policy DM15 of the Development Management Plan 2015. Given the requirements of the Regulations, although I have taken this policy into account where relevant, it has not been determinative in my consideration of this appeal.
4. From the evidence before, and what I have observed on site, the advertisement has been implemented.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. This end of New Zealand Avenue has a busy character due to the convergence of the A-road and the prevalence of commercial units at ground floor level. The area appears to have evolved over time and, as such, the appearance and design of

buildings is eclectic. Nonetheless, the existing advertisements within this commercial area are generally limited to fascias above windows and signs projecting perpendicularly. The commercial units generally feature large windows, which create active frontages and add visual interest. This characteristic makes a positive contribution to the busy character of the area, providing visual permeability into the units from the public realm.

7. The appeal site concerns a ground floor retail unit located close to the southern edge of the New Zealand Avenue commercial parade. The unit is situated between two others and occupies a larger portion of the building's frontage, including two additional windows compared to its neighbours. When visiting the site, I observed that the neighbouring units were vacant.
8. The advertisement introduces two sign panels, each measuring 3.55m by 2.24m, which obscure areas previously designed as windows. By occupying space intended to provide visual permeability into the commercial unit, the signage reduces the unit's contribution to an active frontage and diminishes the visual amenity of the streetscape. This effect is worsened by the advertisement's striking colour, which commands the attention of passersby. As a result, the scheme appears incongruous within its context and undermines the intended appearance and quality of the frontage, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the wider area.
9. Development Plan Policy DM15 is cited on the decision notice and set out the Council's approach in seeking to protect visual amenity. Whilst I have taken this policy into account so far as it is material, it has not been decisive in reaching my conclusion on matters of amenity.

Other Matters

10. The appellant contends that the Council's reason for refusal is not sufficiently detailed to justify its decision. However, I am satisfied that the Council has proportionally and adequately articulated the reason for its decision, enabling me to understand its concerns.
11. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's willingness to work with the Council to form an acceptable solution, this does not materially affect the scheme before me.
12. The Council notes within the delegated report that the appeal site is within the setting of a Scheduled Monument. However, I have not been provided with any further details. Given that this appeal is recommended for dismissal, this matter is not determinative.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

B Plenty

INSPECTOR