

Agenda item: 

**Decision maker:** Planning Committee

**Subject:** Planning appeal decision at Southsea Leisure Park, Melville Road, Southsea, Portsmouth, PO4 9TB

**Report by:** Claire Upton-Brown  
City Development Manager

**Ward affected:** Eastney & Craneswater

**Key decision (over £250k):** No

---

**1. Purpose of report**

To advise the Committee of the outcome of the appeal.

**2. Recommendations**

That the report is noted.

**3. Background**

An advertisement application was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2013 (12/01047/ADV). The application, for the display of one illuminated freestanding sign, was recommended by officers for conditional consent. This recommendation was overturned and the advertisement application was refused for the following reason: 'In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed sign constitutes an incongruous feature out of keeping with the character of the location and the wider contextual street scene, resulting in visual harm to the amenity of the area. The proposal therefore is contrary to paragraph 67 of the Nation Planning Policy Framework and contrary to Policy PSC23 of the Portsmouth Plan'.

In determining the appeal, the Inspector commented on the character of the area: "The area surrounding the Park is primarily residential and non-commercial. The shingle beach is essentially undeveloped and I agree with the Council and the ward councillors that this area is a contrast to the otherwise densely populated city to the north and west. Probably because there are very few commercial premises in the locality, there is an absence of signage and the ambience of the locality is characterised by the predominance of housing and open space, including street trees, richly planted and well-cared for gardens

and other vegetation. Whilst the quality of some boundaries is disappointing, this does not undermine the essentially spacious and sylvan character of this part of Southsea".

Whilst it was acknowledged that a sign had previously been located at the site and that the principle of a smaller sign may be acceptable, the Inspector dismissed the appeal concluding that "The effect of this large sign would be to create an excess of advertising harmful to the appearance of the surroundings. The National Planning Policy Framework says poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built environment and that it is appropriate to take this into account. Because the illumination, garish effect and the size of the proposed sign in this location are excessive, I find that this would be seriously injurious to visual amenity...In the hours of darkness, the impact would probably be substantially greater".

The Inspector considered that the proposed sign would not compromise public safety.

**4. Reason for recommendations**

For information to the Planning Committee.

**5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)**

None.

**6. Head of legal services' comments**

The report is for information only.

**7. Head of finance's comments**

The report is for information only.

.....  
Signed by:

**Appendices:**

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

<b>Title of document</b>	<b>Location</b>
Advertisement application 12/01047/ADV	Planning Services
Appeal decision APP/Z1775/H/13/2199686	Planning Services