



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2026

by R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P1750/Z/25/3376656

14 Victoria Road, Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 7NY

- 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 V Prakash against the decision of Rushmoor Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00520/ADVPP.
 - The advertisement proposed was described as: "Advertisement consent for wall mounted advertisement board."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of a non-illuminated display board which would measure a total height of 2085mm (H) x 5000mm (W), located on the flank wall of 14 Victoria Road at first floor level, approximately 3.6m high from ground level at 14 Victoria Road, Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 7NY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00520/ADVPP, dated 24 September 2025. 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.

Background and Main Issue

2. In my above decision, I have utilised the description of development from the appellant's appeal form rather than that within the application form and above banner heading. The appeal form description provides further detail and appears to accurately describe the proposal.
3. The Regulations set out that decisions shall be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. The National Planning Policy Framework, and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), reiterate this approach.
4. The reason for refusal cites conflict with Policy SP1 of the Rushmoor Local Plan 2014-2032 (adopted 2019) (RLP). However, this policy relates to Aldershot Town Centre only. I note however that the main parties' evidence refers to RLP Policy SP2 governing Farnborough Town Centre, where the appeal site is located. Policy SP2, amongst other things, seeks to promote good design quality and to develop a high-quality network of streets and public spaces. I have therefore had regard to this policy in my determination of this appeal, insofar as it relates to the points of dispute, and this would not prejudice the main parties, or other interested parties.
5. I also note that prior advertisement consent proposals have been refused by the Council at this location. These were however illuminated, whereas the appeal proposal is non-illuminated, and I must consider it on its own merits.

6. The Council has not objected to the proposal on public safety grounds, including the highway. Following my site visit, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons

7. "Amenity" is not defined exhaustively in the Regulations. The PPG sets out (at Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306) that this can mean the effect on visual amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement, where residents or passers-by will be aware of the advertisement.
8. The appeal site is surrounded by many commercial and some residential buildings of varying design and scale. There are also numerous commercial advertisement signs in the vicinity, including many affixed to buildings. The signs have varying sizes and elevation levels from the streets. By their nature, advertisements are designed to be visible by many people. In this respect, the proposal is not notably more commercial or modern than the nearby town centre advertisements.
9. The Council refers to fascia signage placed on the same side elevation as the appeal proposal, at and relating to the ground floor chicken and pizza premises, which does not currently benefit from advertisement consent. That signage was present during my site visit. Even if that signage, or other similar sized structure, were to be retained, the proposed display board would still be proportionate to the overall side elevation. It would not cover the whole of the first-floor side flank or enclose any windows, and similar sized advertisement boards are often found in many town centre locations without detriment to amenity.
10. The display would not relate to a business premises on the appeal site, and there are no similar display board structures in the locality. However, its scale and positioning relative to nearby highway furniture, and the more elevated signage attached to the taller hotel building on the uphill and straight section of Victoria Road, would avoid a visually intrusive or unduly prominent impact on the street scene. The proposal, seen in this town centre context forming its approach from Victoria Road, would not amount to an unsightly proliferation or clutter of signage.
11. There are nearby residences along Victoria Road. The proposal would however be at significant distance away from residential windows. This would avoid a harmful impact on the living conditions and visual amenity of surrounding residents.
12. Development plan policies concerning amenity comprise Policies SP2, DE1 and DE9 of the RLP, and are material to this case. For the above reasons, I conclude that the display of the proposed advertisement would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity. There would thus be no conflict with the above relevant RLP policies in this respect.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR