



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **C Housden BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/B1415/Z/25/3376803

122 Rye Road, Hastings TN35 5DA

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Hastings Borough Council.
 - The application ref is HS/AA/25/00493.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of 1x D-Poster Advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interest of amenity and public safety. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to the Development Plan policies cited in the evidence, but only in so far as these are material to amenity and public safety considerations.
3. The address of the appeal site is listed by the appellant as 122 Rye Road in their application and appeal documents, however the Council considers the address to be 27 Rye Road. Notwithstanding these discrepancies between the parties, based on the red line plan before me I am satisfied I have a sufficient understanding of where the site is, and was suitably able to observe it on my site visit.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity, with particular regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Rye Road comprises a long and busy road, with buildings set in a broadly linear arrangement with properties set back from the road. Whilst there are some notable commercial buildings along the stretch of road, including the adjacent car wash and nearby supermarket, the area is broadly characterised by residential properties. The ground levels of the dwellings situated adjacent to the appeal site are set at a notably lower ground level and the frontages of these properties are enclosed by hedgerow.
6. The proposed advertisement would be set well forward of the existing built building line of the adjacent properties and would directly contrast with the adjacent frontage hedgerow by way of both height and appearance. The proposal would

exceed the eaves heights of the adjacent properties and introduce built form of a considerable width and height in this prominent forward location which would be visible in long views along Rye Road. As such, due to the location, height and width of the advertisement it would appear dominant and imposing within the streetscene. This harm would occur despite the proposed advertisement being static and lit to mimic paper and paste displays.

7. Whilst there are existing advertisements at the appeal site, including, in the location of the proposed advertisement, they are of a smaller scale and do not have the same imposing impact on the character and appearance of the area as the appeal scheme. Their existence would not justify the identified harm.
8. The proposal would therefore result in considerable harm to amenity, with particular regard to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DM3 of the Hastings Development Management Plan (2015) in so far as it is material to the appeal. This policy, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure outdoor advertisements do not detrimentally affect the appearance of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. The Council's officer report sets out that it considers that the proposal would not result in harm to public safety. The evidence before me and my observations on site do not lead me to a different conclusion to that of the Council on this matter.
10. The appellant has set out the social, economic and environmental benefits of the proposal. However, there is no indication in the Regulations or the National Planning Policy Framework that any of these other factors can be taken into account as advertisements are subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety.
11. The appellant has highlighted an example of an advertisement granted by the Council at 139 – 143 Ashburnham Road¹. However, this is situated well away from the site specific context of the appeal proposal so would not be directly comparable. In addition, a range of examples across the country have been provided where similar sized displays have been granted consent at car washes. However, again these are situated well outside of the site-specific context of the appeal proposal, so are also not directly comparable. As such, I cannot afford them any positive weight which would weigh in favour of the proposal. Furthermore, each proposal should be assessed on its individual merits which I have done so in this case.
12. The appellant has raised concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter which would alter my findings which I have had regard solely to the merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA ref HS/AA/23/00006