
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H0724/Z/25/3376057

46 Victoria Road, Hartlepool TS26 8DD

- 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 Robert Moore against the decision of Hartlepool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/2025/0111.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of 2no. signs to the front elevation at first floor level and 1no. sign to the side elevation at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 2no. signs to the front elevation at first floor level and 1no. sign to the side elevation at first floor level as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The location of the appeal site in the above banner heading has been taken from the appeal form as this accurately describes the location of the appeal site. The description of the development has been taken from the decision notice as this concisely and accurately describes the proposed development.
3. The works as described above has already taken place on site. The appeal has therefore been assessed on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of visual amenity and public safety. The assessment regarding public safety is not disputed and the main issue is therefore the effect of the advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to Gladstone House, a two-storey end of terrace commercial property situated at the corner of Grange Road and Murray Street. The appeal property is located within the West Victoria Road edge of Town Centre and the Grange Conservation Area (CA). It faces the busy Victoria Road to the south and there are a mixture of residential and commercial uses nearby with the town centre a short distance to the east. The area therefore has a mixed character and there are other advertisements and signage in the vicinity including existing commercial signage to nearby establishments.

6. The property features in views along Victoria Road/Grange Road and the host property is a former Victorian property with historical character and features such as canopy, neoclassical columns, double hipped roof, bay windows, quoins, decorative window heads and dentil course. Such common characteristics with other properties give the area a homogenous feel.
7. The development seeks retrospective advertisement consent for the display of 2no. signs to the front elevation at first floor level and 1no. sign to the side elevation at first floor level. The front elevation comprises two separate signs located either side of the central, first floor window. One of the signs incorporates the company logo whilst the other incorporates a slogan and contact details. The side elevation to the west faces towards Murry Street and the signage on this elevation incorporates all of the same details of those on the front elevation at first floor level. The signs are printed on white, uPVC foam boards and the lettering is self-adhesive vinyl in a contemporary style, with colours including blue and orange shades.
8. As set out, the appeal site falls within the CA which is recognised for its architectural, historical, and cultural significance. I have a duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. I have also had regard to paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
9. Whilst three signs are proposed, each sign has a flat profile and is non-illuminated. They are each small in scale located at first floor level and there is a good amount of space surrounding each sign where they do not dominate the host building or screen historical detailing. The level of detail is proportionate to the type of sign and does not amount to visual clutter. The colour also avoids excessive prominence or visual conflict with the host buildings character. The signs are simply reflective of the commercial nature of the host property and the immediate surrounding area. To this end, it is not unreasonable for commercial properties to have signage to the front of their properties to either provide contact details or make it easier for people to find. I do not find the signs to be excessive given their small-scale nature. I observed other signs nearby and did not find the signage to unduly stand out as a dominant addition in this context nor did I find the signage to visually detract from the historical features of the host property or surrounding area.
10. I understand that the property has historically had signage associated with it and whilst there is some dispute regarding the scale of previous signage, advertisement would still be a familiar feature on this property and its overall scale, materials, design and siting appears proportionate to the type of sign and consistent with other advertisements in the surrounding area. These advertisements vary somewhat in size and format but are clearly visible when travelling along the nearby roads and form part of the established character of the area.
11. Having regard to the character of the locality, including the presence of various advertising displays, and existing commercial signage to nearby establishments, the advertisement display does not appear out of keeping in this setting which is

clearly an established location for advertisements and signs. The Council has suggested an alternative in terms of window transfers and a sign of smaller scale. However, this would not alter my findings on the scheme I am considering which I do not find to be excessive or incongruous.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not unacceptably harm visual amenity. It therefore preserves the character and appearance of the CA. I have taken into account Policies QP4, QP8, and HE3 of the Hartlepool Local Plan, 2018 which explain amongst other things, that the Borough Council will seek to ensure that advertisements are appropriately located within the Borough and are of an appropriate scale and size. Advertisements which introduce visually obtrusive features will not be permitted. Given I have concluded that the proposal does not harm visual amenity, the development does not conflict with these policies or Chapter 16 of the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conditions

13. The five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations are imposed in the terms of my decision.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR