

## Appeals Progress Report

### 1. New Appeal

- 1.1 A new appeal has been lodged against the refusal of planning permission (23/00007/REFUSE) for: "Advertisement Consent : Display of 6 X 3 metre illuminated digital advertisement display panel at first-floor level on side elevation of building following removal of two existing paper & paste billboard advertisement panels at ground-floor level" at **41 Station Road, Aldershot**. This application was determined under delegated powers (23/00306/ADVPP) and will be dealt with by the Planning Inspectorate using the Commercial Appeals Service fast-track procedure.

### 2. Appeal Decisions

#### 27 Church Road East, Farnborough

- 2.1 An appeal against refusal of planning application 23/00055/FULPP for 'Retention of boundary fencing and electric gates to front boundary' was refused in March 2023 on this corner site, for the following reasons:

1. The siting of the existing fence directly at the back of the pavement in combination with its overall height, length and design is considered to result in an unduly overbearing form of development at a prominent position within the street. The development, as erected, is therefore considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to Policy DE1 of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) and the Rushmoor Home Improvements and Extensions Supplementary Guidance February 2020.

It is noted that the fencing has already been erected.

- 2.2 The Inspector noted that the Church Road East street scene has a verdant character and the different forms of front boundary treatment are generally low in height with an open character to the street. The Inspector considered that the proposed boundary treatment, comprising an increased height fence and against the footpath and extending along the full frontage of the site result in an enclosure of the streetscene contrary to the established character., that is contrary to Policy DE1 of the Local Plan and guidance in the Home Improvements SPD. Other examples of high close board fencing in the area did not change the Inspector's view stating that these were in the minority do not "set a precedent that I consider would harmfully erode the character of the streetscene'. The Inspector stated that there are other forms of boundary treatment that could provide privacy and security for the appellant.
- 2.3 The appeal was dismissed.

## **Empire Banqueting and Hall, Aldershot**

2.4 An appeal against refusal of advertisement consent application 23/00073/ADVPP for 'Display of internally illuminated digital advertising billboard measuring 6m x 3m with new image displaying every 10 seconds' at Empire Banqueting and Hall, High Street, Aldershot has been determined by the Inspectorate. The Council refused the application in April 2023 for the following reason:

1. The proposed sign, by way of its large size, design and visually prominent siting, would result in the introduction of an unacceptable alien feature on the application building and in the streetscene, that would be detrimental to amenity as a result of being unsympathetic to and adversely affecting the historic special interest and architectural character of a Locally Listed Heritage asset; the identified Victorian visual character of the Aldershot West Conservation Area and the general mixed residential, commercial and civic character and appearance of the Aldershot Town Centre. The application is therefore contrary to Policies DE9, HE1, HE3, DE1 and SP1 of the Rushmoor Local Plan, the relevant provisions of the Locally Listed Heritage Assets SPD (2020) and Aldershot Prospectus SPD (2016) and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF (last updated in July 2021).

2.5 The Inspector considered that although the sign is large, it is proportionate in scale to the host building, the Empire, and would not obscure any key architectural features on the building such as the banding/window frames, and would not result in a proliferation of signs given the separation to the shops on High Street. The level of illumination would be low, and the conditions provided by the appellant would control this satisfactorily. The Inspector felt that the sign was not inconsistent with Policies SP1 (Aldershot Town Centre) or the Aldershot Prospectus or Heritage Assets SPD. Subject to conditions, the Inspector considers the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effect upon the amenity of the area, and the appeal was dismissed, with imposition of conditions to control illumination, and address highway safety concerns.

2.6 The appeal is allowed.

### **3. Recommendation**

3.1 It is recommended that the report be **NOTED**.

**Tim Mills**  
**Executive Head of Property and Growth**