

# COMMITTEE REPORT

## AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 6

---

### APPEAL UPDATE REPORT

#### APPEALS DETERMINED

#### **Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the Erection and display of non illuminated fascia sign (DM/17/00724/AD) at 14 West Terrace, Coxhoe.**

An appeal against the refusal of Planning Permission for the above development was received on 12 May 2017 and considered valid on 4 September 2017. The application was refused under delegated powers for the following reasons:

*“The advertisement by reason of its siting and scale would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area and therefore have an adverse impact on visual amenity, contrary to Policies Q16 and Q17 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004 and paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework”.*

The appeal was dealt with by way of written representations and an unaccompanied site visit. The Inspector in determining the appeal considered that the main issue was the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

The Planning Inspector noted that the appeal site was the only commercial building in a group of otherwise residential properties and that due to its position, the proposed advertisement would not be visible to pedestrians or motorists approaching the site from the north. However, the presence of a car park area adjacent to the site provided greater exposure of the gable wall where the advertisement would be located and as a result the advertisement would be prominent when approaching the site from the south.

The Inspector also commented regarding the existing advertisement on the front wall of the building, which was considered to relate well to the architecture of the building given its position above the display window and entrance door however, concluded that the proposed advertisement would not be related to any architectural features on the building and would appear as a visually incongruous feature on the otherwise blank gable wall which would be inconsistent with the predominantly residential character of the surrounding buildings.

The Inspector accepted the views of the appellant that there are examples of advertising on the gables of other buildings within the village, however, these are located further south in an area which has a much more obvious commercial character or within the village centre. The group of buildings which contains the appeal site are separated from these by a significant gap in the built form of the village and are not seen within the same context as them.

The Inspector therefore dismissed the appeal as it was considered to cause harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Report prepared by Lisa Morina, Planning Officer