



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31ST January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H4505/Z/23/3334676

Former Debenhams Unit, Metro Centre, Gateshead NE11 9YG

- 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 Frasers Group against the decision of Gateshead Council.
 - The application Ref DC/23/00554/ADV, dated 26 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2023.
 - The advertisements proposed are 6no illuminated signs (references 05, 06, 13, 14, 17 and 18 as shown on drawing no CPS 21 120 PL 004 B).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the 6no illuminated signs (references 05, 06, 13, 14, 17 and 18 as shown on drawing no CPS 21 120 PL 004 B) as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council issued a split decision which granted consent for some of the advertisements applied for¹. The appeal therefore relates to the refused advertisements only, and I have used the description given in the appeal form to reflect this.
3. As the advertisements subject to this appeal are already in situ, I am considering the proposal retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The Regulations to control advertisements require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any concerns on public safety grounds and I have no reason to disagree.
5. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the advertisements on amenity.

Reasons

6. The appeal signs are displayed at the south-western corner of the shopping centre. Although in a prominent position, the signs are relatively small features in relation to the large building and have a neat, compact arrangement. They do not detract from the design of this part of the building or lead to any sense of an over-proliferation of signage on the wider building and surrounding area. Nor does their siting or appearance interfere with, or unduly distract from, the

¹ Signs 01, 02, 03, 04, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16.

landmark art feature on top of the building. Accordingly, I can see nothing unusual or harmful about their number, scale, and location.

7. I therefore conclude that the advertisements are not harmful to the interests of amenity. Thus, the proposals also comply with the advertisement and general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and subject to the standard advertisement conditions set out in the Regulations, the appeal should succeed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR