

PLANNING INSPECTORATE APPEAL DECISIONS		
20188048A	160 BELGRAVE ROAD, BELGRAVE COMMERCIAL CENTRE	
Proposal:	INSTALLATION OF THREE EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED HOARDINGS ON ROOF OF BANK (CLASS A2)	
Appellant:	GAYSAHIMA PROPERTIES	
Appeal type:	Advertisement Appeal	
Appeal received:	20 August 2018	
Appeal decision:	Dismissed	
Appeal dec date:	15 March 2019	
TB	AREA: E	WARD: Belgrave



©Crown Copyright Reserved. Leicester City Council Licence 100019264(2019). Ordnance Survey mapping does not imply any ownership boundaries and does not always denote the exact ground features.

Summary

- The appeal related to a single storey building located on a corner between Belgrave Road and Law Street in the Belgrave Road District Shopping Centre.
- The application was refused under delegated powers in August 2018 by reason of significant detrimental impact on the appearance and character of the prominent site and the surrounding area.
- The appeal was dismissed.

Location and Site Description

The site is located immediately adjacent to a five storey building, which is a former Victorian factory building. To the front of the site is the A classified Belgrave Road, also known as the Golden Mile, which is an important thoroughfare into and out of the City Centre.

The Proposal and Decision

Vegetation was proposed to the sides and below the hoardings. The hoardings, along with the surrounding vegetation, spanned across much of the Belgrave Road elevation (for 7.9 metres), turning 45° to the North West (for 6.8 metres) and then along the Law Street elevation (for 7.9 metres). The bases of the hoardings were 3.95 metres above ground level, whilst the overall height was 6.95 metres above ground level. The signs themselves had a height of 3 metres. Along the Belgrave Road and Law Street elevation the hoardings were set back 1.5 metres from the face of the building, whilst the depths of the signs were 0.2 metres. The two hoardings fronting the road/street were 7 metres in width, whilst the sign on the corner of the building was 6.8 metres in width. The indicative location of the static illumination was two LED lights located to the lower front of each sign.

The application was refused for the following reason: *“The proposed hoardings by reason of their siting, size, numbers and illumination would be visually intrusive and as such would have significant detrimental impact on the appearance and character of this prominent site and the surrounding area in conflict with Core Strategy policy CS03.”*

The Appeal Decision

The appeal was dismissed.

Commentary

The Inspector noted that the hoardings would have a dominating visual effect on the appearance of the building by reason of the width and height in relation to the host building, and would dwarf the signage below associated with the building's primary use as a bank. The hoardings would also be out of context with signs on other buildings in close proximity to the site, which whilst plentiful are relatively modest in scale and generally relate to the use of the buildings on which they are displayed. The impact of the proposed hoardings would be accentuated by their position close to the edge of the roof and their illumination on this prominent corner site.

The Inspector did not agree with the conclusions of the appellant's Visual Impact Assessment for the reasons given above. The Inspector also did not consider that any other hoarding advertisements within Leicester City Council's authoritative boundary and along the 'Golden Mile', which were brought to the Inspector's attention by the appellant, were directly comparable to the characteristics of the appeal proposal.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed advertisement hoardings due to their size, position on a roof top in a prominent corner location and illumination would be obtrusive within the street scene resulting in material harm to the amenity of the area.