

DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

APPEAL AGAINST REFUSAL FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

APPLICATION REF. NOS:	25/01101/FUL & 25/01102/ADV
APPEAL REF. NOS	Appeal Ref Nos: 6003715 & 6003716
LOCATION:	Footpath opposite 38 Blackwellgate, Darlington DL1 5HW
DESCRIPTION:	Installation of 1No. BT Street Hub Unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit.
APPLICANT:	BT Group Plc

PLANNING OFFICER: ANDREW HARKER

BRIEF SUMMARY:

1. Advertisement consent and planning permission were both refused for the installation of a BT Street Hub Unit with advertisement panels on either side. The Hub was located within the public footpath opposite No 38 Blackwellgate.

KEY POINTS TO NOTE:

2. The Hub would be located within the Town Centre Conservation Area and within the setting of neighbouring listed buildings.

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL:

3. Planning application reference number 25/01101/FUL was refused on the grounds that the Hub would have an adverse impact on the general character of the local environment and would result in additional street clutter. It was also considered that the Hub would have an adverse impact on the Town Centre Conservation Area and the setting of No 32 Blackwellgate, which is a Grade II listed building and no public benefits had been identified that would outweigh that harm caused to the heritage assets.
4. Advertisement consent reference number 25/01102/ADV was refused as the display panels within the Hub would harm the character and amenity of the streetscape and would harm the Conservation Area and setting of the neighbouring listed building (No 32 Blackwellgate)

APPEAL DISMISSED:

5. The Planning Inspector found that the proposals would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and cause harm to the significance of the Town Centre Conservation Area. The Inspector also considered that the Hub and advertisement panels would fail to preserve the setting of listed buildings. Having had regard to the scale and nature of the proposed hub relative to the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole, the harm was identified as being “less than substantial” and the Planning Inspector concluded that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, and the considerable importance and weight that this carried. On that basis, both planning appeals were dismissed.