



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2007

by **Noel Hutchinson**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
16 JUL 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/H/07/1201489

50A Blackwell Street, Kidderminster, Worcestershire DY10 2EE

- 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 Beacon Outdoor Limited against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 07/0071/ADVE, dated 12 January 2007, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2007.
- The advertisement proposed is a 48-sheet ultra-vision display unit with illumination.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The appeal premises consist of a modest three storey building with a shop at ground floor level. The panel would be displayed at about first floor level across the south west facing plain gable wall. It would overlook a large open roundabout junction on the ring road and the open frontage to a Vauxhall garage, in an area of mixed use. At the time of my inspection advertisements displayed on the premises included a flex faced sign on the gable wall and a fascia sign on the street façade. Other advertisements displayed in the area included fascia signs, flag signs, individually lettered signs and projecting box signs.
3. The appeal premises occupy a particularly prominent position exposed by the large open expanse of roundabout. The building is domestic in its scale and general appearance, although there is a small shop front at ground floor level on the road façade. The gable wall is plain with the exception of a small domestic window between first and second floor levels. Measuring some 6m wide by 3m high the panel would cover a large proportion of the wall at first floor level. Illustrated as fitting tightly up to the underside of the small window the panel would be the largest single feature on the building. The panel would not be in scale and would pay no regard to the building's design and use. In my view it would appear as an obtrusive form of development alien to the fabric of the building.
4. Although there is commercial activity in this area of mixed use the panel would appear above the general level of commercial facades. It would also be considerably larger than business signing. Its exposed siting would make the panel particularly prominent and coupled with its impact on the appearance of

the building I take the view that the panel would appear as an unduly prominent and obtrusive form of development that would be out of keeping with its surroundings to the detriment of their character and appearance.

5. I conclude that the panel would be detrimental to amenity and that I should dismiss the appeal.

Noel Hutchinson
INSPECTOR