

---

No Delegated Items

---

Appeals Received North Sunderland  
Between 01/09/2011 and 30/09/2011

<u>Team Ref No</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Appeal Decision</u>	<u>Date Of Decision</u>
--------------------	----------------	--------------------	------------------------	-------------------------

None Received

---

## Appeals Determined North Sunderland

Between 01/09/2011 and 30/09/2011

Team	Ref No	ADDRESS	Descriptio	Appeal Decision	Date of Decision
N					
	11/00005/ADV	Land South Of St Peters Metro Station North Bridge Street Sunderland	Erection of 1no. illuminated hoarding sign.	DISMIS	9/8/2011



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2011

**by Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 7 September 2011**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/H/11/2152774**

**Land at North Bridge Street, facing Dame Dorothy Street, Sunderland,  
SR6 0AD**

- 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 J C Decaux against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
  - The application Ref 11/00216/ADV, dated 24 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2011.
  - The advertisement proposed is single, externally illuminated, 48 sheet advertisement display.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has pointed out that the location plan submitted with the application is incorrect. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plan submitted by the appellant as part of the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and on the setting of Wearmouth Bridge, Monkwearmouth Railway Bridge and the St Peter's area candidate World Heritage Site.

### Reasons

4. It is common ground that North Bridge Street is of commercial character although there are relatively few advertisements or non-traffic signs, and certainly nothing of the size of the proposed display, in the section of the street between Dame Dorothy Street and the Wearmouth Bridge. Moreover, this section of road is a 'gateway' to the city centre providing fine views, for both pedestrians and drivers, of the listed Wearmouth and Monkwearmouth bridges.
5. The large panel would be clearly seen in southbound drivers' views of the bridges and it would block sight of these structures for pedestrians emerging from the metro station. It would also obscure views of the landscaped area next to the station and of the relatively attractive railway viaduct behind it. Whilst there is not public access to this land it nonetheless contributes towards the attractiveness of the area. Moreover, the panel would have an awkward relationship with the glass, metro station lift tower, which it would, at an angle, virtually abut, undermining its striking square form and the almost free-standing design of this beacon-like structure.

6. In this context, and bearing in mind the panel's size and prominence, I consider that the proposal would be inappropriately intrusive and would thus harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the setting of the bridges. In accordance with policy B21 of the adopted *City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan* (UDP) I have considered the proposal on the basis of its effect on amenity. Whilst noting that its site is not a location specifically identified as inappropriate for advert displays by the Council's *Supplementary Guidance Development Control Guidelines* and that the proposal would accord with some of this document's specific requirements, I conclude that significant harm would be caused. It would also conflict with UDP policies B2 and B10 which require development to respect and enhance its locality and to not adversely affect the setting of listed buildings.
7. Although the proposal would be located in the 'Buffer Zone' of the candidate World Heritage site, it would not be seen from St Peter's church (which is the focus of the site), nor, it appears to me, by the majority of people heading towards the site. I therefore conclude that significant harm to the candidate site or its setting would not result and that the proposal would thus not conflict with UDP policy NA28A. However, I consider that the harm which would be caused by the advertisement to the North Bridge Street street scene and the setting of the listed bridges justifies refusal of permission.
8. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Malcolm Rivett*

INSPECTOR