

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No. and Parish</b>	<b>8/13 Week Date</b>	<b>Proposal, Location and Applicant</b>
(2)	17/00190/ADV Chaddleworth	4 April 2017	5 directional fascia board signs, The Ibx Inn, Chaddleworth.  Chaddleworth Parish Council

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=17/00190/ADV>

**Recommendation Summary:**                    **The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to REFUSE advertisement consent.**

**Ward Member(s):**                                Councillor C Hooker

**Reason for Committee determination:**                    Called in by Cllr. Hooker – refusal will not support the attraction of trade for the public house and village store.

**Committee Site Visit:**                         30<sup>th</sup> March 2017

**Contact Officer Details**

**Name:**    Liz Moffat  
**Job Title:**                                         Assistant Planning Officer  
**Tel No:**    (01635) 519336  
**E-mail Address:**                                [emoffat@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:emoffat@westberks.gov.uk)

## 1. Site History

04/02547/ADV – Double sided sign for The Stag Inn at land adjacent to B4494 (opposite Egypt Cottages) APPROVED at Committee 16.02.05

## 2. Publicity of Application

Site Notice Expired: 9 March 2017

## 3. Consultations and Representations

**Parish Council:** Unable to comment

**Highways:** No objections to Signs 1, 3, 4 and 5  
Object to Sign 2 – within highway land and therefore unacceptable.  
Suggest relocating sign to the south side of the road, beyond the boundary.

**Archaeology:** Evidence suggests that there will be no major impact on any features of archaeological significance.

**Correspondence:** One letter of objection – whilst sympathetic to the commercial difficulties suffered by pub trade, advertisement hoardings should be resisted in the AONB. Regarding proposed sign at Egypt turning on B4494 – dangerous junction with several bad accidents.

## 4. Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 – Paragraph 67  
West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 - Policies ADDP 5 – North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), CS14 - Design Principles, CS19 - Historic Environment and Landscape Character

## 5. Description of Development

Advertisement consent is sought for 5 identical non-illuminated, directional board signs for Ibex Inn in Chaddleworth. The proposed locations are:

- Sign 1 – B4494 to Newbury (Egypt) **(3000 metres from the Ibex Inn.)**
- Sign 2 – Hangman's Stone Lane (nr West Berks Golf Club) **(1,250 metres)**
- Sign 3 – Farnborough Copse (B4494) **(5,000 metres)**
- Sign 4 – Trindledown Copse (A338) **(3,500 metres)**
- Sign 5 – Buckham Hill (A338) **(3,300 metres)**

The signs are proposed in open countryside within the AONB. The figures shown in bold represent the approximate distances (by road) between the Public House and its advertisement.

The proposed signs will be aluminium on 2 - 2.5 metre high posts, and measure 700mm in width and 565mm high.

## 6. Consideration of the Proposal

Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account cumulative impacts.

### 6.1. The impact on the visual amenity

6.1.1 The application sites are situated in sensitive, rural locations as detailed above. Therefore it is important to ensure that any development within these areas is appropriate. The NPPF discusses supporting a prosperous rural economy and local and neighbourhood plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages such as local shops and public houses. The impact of advertisements on the visual amenity of these sensitive areas is an important consideration, particularly given the fact that the sites are located within the AONB and therefore afforded a greater level of protection.

6.1.2 Paragraph 67 of the NPPF states that poorly placed adverts can have a negative impact on the appearance of the natural environment. Control over outdoor advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. In assessing the impact on amenity, the Local Planning Authority should have regard to what impact, including cumulative impact, the proposals will have on the surrounding area. Whilst businesses in the countryside will expect to advertise their whereabouts, care should be taken to ensure that a proliferation of individually acceptable signs does not spoil the appearance of the open countryside. Although it is acknowledged that businesses in rural locations such as this may require some form of advertisement in order to prosper, it is not considered that this form of advert is appropriate or acceptable, particularly given the remoteness of the signs from the Public House they are advertising.

6.1.3 It is considered that the use of an officially approved highway sign may be produced to meet the needs of the community, which may not require planning permission. Further consideration could be given to the use of a brown 'tourism' sign, if the Public House fulfils the necessary requirements (a matter which the Local Planning Authority is not directly involved with and which would require research on the part of the applicant to confirm whether this is an option).

6.1.4 If the application were allowed, it would not be unreasonable for further advertisements for similar signage in the vicinity or across the district to be sought, which the Local Planning Authority would then find difficult to resist. This would lead to an unacceptable proliferation of signage in the open countryside which would harm the character and appearance of such sensitive, rural locations.

6.1.5 Consideration has been given to a sign for the Swan Public House in East Ilsley which is located to the west side of the A34, just south of the East Ilsley junction. It should be noted that in 1993 the Planning Inspectorate stated that the decision to allow the sign "should not be taken as an indication that a comparable advertisement in another location would necessarily be regarded as acceptable." The primary reason for granting this consent is the fact that this sign had been in situ for many years.

### 6.2 The impact on highway/public safety

6.2.1 The Council's Highways team have no objections to the proposed locations, apart from Sign 2. This sign could be easily relocated to the south of the highway boundary to be considered acceptable.

6.2.2 The sign for the Stag Public House at Leckhampstead which is sited in a similar location to that proposed for Sign 1, was approved in 2005. On this occasion the Council's Highways team objected to the design and siting as it would distract drivers and could result in sudden and unpredictable vehicle movements to the detriment of road safety.

## 7. Conclusion

7.1. Having taken account of all relevant policy considerations and the material considerations referred to above, it is considered that there are clear reasons why the development proposed is unacceptable. There is no justification to allow the signs in this sensitive rural location.

## 8. Full Recommendation

8.1 The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to **REFUSE** advertisement consent for the following reasons:

1. The proposed signs, due to their size and siting in an isolated countryside location would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of this nationally designated sensitive Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There is no justification to allow these advertisements, which will be situated a considerable distance from, and will therefore be unrelated to the Public House they seek to advertise. As such the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies ADDP5, CS14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 -2026. These policies and government advice seek to ensure that, inter alia, advertisements, and proposals within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, do not lead to a detrimental impact on visual amenity.
2. If this application were allowed it would not be unreasonable for further advertisements for similar signage in the vicinity or across the district to be sought, which the Local Planning Authority would then find difficult to resist. This would cumulatively lead to an unacceptable proliferation of signage within the open countryside, a matter which is specifically referred to within the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 67 and which would harm the character and appearance of such sensitive, rural locations.

DC