



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc

### Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 September 2020

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/Z/20/3247327

### Land Os 3963 Part (A30), West of Snowdon Heights, Chard, Somerset TA20 1QX

- 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 Ben Porter (The Cotley Inn) against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/01541/ADV, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as, "sign w/ company logo, small block of info about pub – directional arrow. 1400mm x 1500mm."
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on amenity.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an open field, set within a rural area consisting of gently rolling fields, which are clearly visible above the relatively insubstantial soft landscaping adjacent to the road. I observed two small signs adjacent to and opposite Touchstone Lane, but due to their location they appear as a natural part of the nearby settlement. In contrast, the proposed structure would be situated in the middle of the field. It would be approximately 2m in total height, with two large signs positioned on cylindrical supports. Due to their size and proposed location, the signs would undermine views across the open fields, and would appear overly prominent in this countryside setting, thereby harming amenity.
5. The field signs and brown highway signs referred to by the appellant all appear to be materially different in terms of their design, and therefore they are not sufficiently comparable with the appeal proposal. The appellant has stated that the signs would benefit their business and that not having these is affecting business levels. However, I have not been provided with sufficient evidence to

convincingly demonstrate this, therefore this matter has been given limited weight and it does not outweigh the harm identified.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on amenity. In accordance with Regulation 3(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), material to my findings is Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006 – 2028) (adopted March 2015). This provides that development will be designed to achieve a high quality, which promotes South Somerset’s local distinctiveness and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the district. The advertisements would conflict with this Policy. In accordance with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is appropriate for express consent to be withheld for the advertisements, in the interests of amenity.

### **Other Matter**

7. I note the advice provided by the Somerset County Council Traffic Officer with respect to brown highway signs. However, this would not diminish the harm that would arise, and it does not outweigh my finding on the main issue.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

8. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alex O’Doherty*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector’s Decision**

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer’s report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR