



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2018

**by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16 April 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/Z/17/3190710**

**Merville, Blackpool Road, Newton with Clifton PR4 0XD**

- 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 Miss Townsend against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 17/0778, dated 11 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2017.
  - The advertisement proposed is two non-illuminated banner signs to the front elevation, one non-illuminated banner sign on rear elevation, one non-illuminated double sided totem pole to rear driveway.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance, and in determining the appeal I have only had regard to the planning merits of the case.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the visual impact of the signs on the building and within the surroundings.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow located close to the junction of Blackpool Road and Preston Old Road. As such, the property has frontages to both of these roads. Whilst there are commercial uses either side of the site, and a large garden centre nearby, the character of the surrounding area, particularly along Preston Old Road, is predominantly residential.
5. The signs were in position on the property when I visited the site. The two signs on the front elevation are mounted on a structure that wraps around the bay windows on either side of the front door. The size of the signs is such that they are wider than the bay windows and each one covers about the top third of the window. To the rear of the dwelling a totem sign is located on the driveway adjacent to the pavement, and a banner sign is located on the rear elevation and extends virtually the full width of the elevation.
6. Notwithstanding the fact that the signs have been professionally produced and fitted, given the domestic scale and nature of the host property, they are

disproportionately large and unduly prominent features. The signs on the building, particularly those around the bay windows, have an uncomfortable and unsympathetic relationship to the host property and appear as incongruous and bulky features on it. In being located close to the pavement, the totem sign on the Preston Old Road frontage is a strident feature in the street scene.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an adverse impact both on the building and the surrounding area.
8. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various types of advertising associated with the commercial businesses either side of the bungalow. However, the signs on these buildings are more proportionate to the size of their host property, and so they do not form such dominant features. Moreover, as these are commercial uses and buildings, they do not form a direct parallel with the appeal scheme which is a dwelling. In any case I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
9. The appellant has argued that the signs are needed to advertise the new child minding business she is establishing. However, I am not persuaded that this is the only way this can be done, and that there are not other ways that the existence of the firm could be advertised that would not cause the harm that I have identified.
10. It is agreed by both parties that the signs would not give rise to any concerns regarding safety. Nothing I have seen or read leads me to come to a different conclusion in this regard.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alison Partington*

INSPECTOR