



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2013

by Sukie Tamplin Dip TP Pg Dip Arch Cons IHBC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 May 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/H/12/2187788

A1 Recovery Ltd, 8 New Lane, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2JH

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Eames on behalf of A1 Recovery Ltd against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/12/00748, dated 18 July 2012, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2012.
 - The advertisements proposed are signs on the A1 Office Building: RMI sign (1); Warning Private Land sign (2), on the Wood work building: Warning CCTV sign (3), on the wood work building (facing north): Warning Private Land sign (4), and on the Vehicle Workshop (facing north): A1 Recovery sign (5); Scaffolding Solutions sign (6).
-

Procedural matter

1. The signs listed in the heading to this decision have already been installed. The Council has issued a split decision notice granting express consent for 11 other signs on the appeal site six but refusing the remaining 6 which are the subject of the appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the visual impact of the signs on the buildings and their surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is on prominent corner immediately to the north of a level crossing. The site is partly enclosed by a metal paling fence and comprises an open yard and a group of buildings in the south east corner. A number of separate businesses appear to be operating from the site. The buildings and the signage are clearly visible from the public road, particularly from the north, including by occupants of vehicles waiting to cross the mainline railway.
5. In recognition of the business needs of the different enterprises operating from the site various signs have been granted consent. The majority of the remainder, subject of this appeal, duplicate signage and information already clearly visible on the site.
6. **Sign 1** is a small roughly square information sign to the north of the reception area and could, as suggested by the appellants, be incorporated into the larger

generic sign adjacent to the main reception door. As a separate sign, its presence adds to an impression of clutter and is harmful to the appearance of the area.

7. **Sign 2** is located below Sign 1 and is a small rectangular warning sign replicated by others within the site and in common with Sign 1 creates an appearance of clutter.
8. **Sign 3** is also a small rectangular warning sign but this replicates signage with consent adjacent to the main reception building. In itself the sign is not unduly prominent but in combination with all the other signage on the site it adds to the cumulative effect of the multiplicity of signage and harm to amenity.
9. **Sign 4** has the same appearance as sign 2, warning again that the site is private land and results in a harmful excess of signage on the prominent north facing wall of the Woodwork shop.
10. **Sign 5** is a large sign naming the company operating in the premises and located on the gable wall facing north and above the vehicle workshop. I do not agree that that the metal palisade fencing obstructs views of the main vehicle workshop from the public highway and saw that there are multiple signs that confirm that A1 Recovery operate from the site. These include the circular logo above the vehicle workshop, signage at the entrance gate and on the Woodwork building and office/reception buildings on either side of the main gate. These would be clearly visible to potential customers, irrespective of the direction they are arriving at the premises. The display of Sign 5 is over-dominant and creates clutter which harms the appearance of the locality.
11. **Sign 6** is a smaller rectangular sign also located above the vehicle workshop on its north facing gable and also repeats information clearly visible and appropriately located at the reception area. The company subject of the sign does not appear to operate from the vehicle workshop building. The multiplicity of signs comprising Sign 5, Sign 6 and the consented circular sign on this prominent gable result in an unpleasant clutter which harms the appearance of the building and its surroundings.

Conclusion

12. With the exception of Sign 5, the individual signs are not unduly dominant on the buildings or within the surroundings and I accept that the site is industrial in character and some signage is appropriate. But, the site is particularly prominent and on a well used route into the town centre and the cumulative effect of so many signs results in an impression of random clutter and excess of advertising harmful to the appearance of the buildings and its surroundings. I note that guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework says that it is appropriate to take into account cumulative impacts and because I conclude that the number of signs is excessive and this is injurious to amenity, the appeal is dismissed.

Sukie Tamplin

INSPECTOR