

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/Z/16/3160182

Unit 4a, St Andrews Quay, Kingston-Upon-Hull HU3 4SA

- 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 Mr Benson, Wren Living Ltd against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01132/ADV, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2016.
 - The advertisements proposed are 2 internally illuminated fascia signs to the rear elevation (5.5m wide x 3.5m high x 0.2m deep) and 1 internally illuminated fascia sign to the rear elevation (10.8m wide x 3.5m high x 0.2m deep).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs to the rear elevation (5.5m wide x 3.5m high x 0.2m deep) and 1 internally illuminated fascia sign to the rear elevation (10.8m wide x 3.5m high x 0.2m deep) 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposed signs have already been provided on site.
3. I have taken the description of the signs, which has not been disputed by the appellant, from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the signs on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large retail warehouse, within a linear group of similar sized units that form part of a wider retail park. The proposed signs are on the rear elevation of the building facing the slip road entrance to the A63 Clive Sullivan Way.
 6. The approach on adjacent and nearby units has typically been to incorporate single signs which are contained within the width of purposely designed gantry frames. Accordingly that signage tends to be relatively modest and understated, retaining a sense of proportion with the host building.
-

7. In contrast the proposed signs adjoin one another, straddling the respective gantry frames for the unit that they relate to and are greater in depth compared to other nearby signs. Notwithstanding this, the tops of the proposed signs are generally aligned with the signage on nearby units and do not exceed the eaves height of the building. Furthermore, the cumulative proposed signage, whilst expansive and greater in width than the nearby singular signs, would be significantly separated from them. The proposed signs would not therefore dominate or clutter the building facade. In addition, whilst not adhering to strict uniformity in the pattern of signage, they would conform with the horizontal emphasis of the building form. As such the signs would still appear proportionate to the building.
8. In terms of design, the size and style of lettering is broadly consistent with other signage in the locality. The green colouring of the central sign is relatively prominent and would serve to draw the eye. However it would not appear unduly strident in the context of the surrounding commercial retail park environment and would not detract from the somewhat functional appearance and large scale boxy form of the warehouse building itself.
9. In terms of visibility, the signage would be prominent from the entrance slip road to the A63 Clive Sullivan Way. However, the appeal building is significantly set back from this part of the highway and at lower ground level which serves to mitigate visual impact. I conclude that the signs do not stand out as incongruous or unduly dominant and do not result in a sense of clutter or disruption to the overall harmony of the building facade. Consequently there is no significant harm to the visual amenity of the area.
10. Accordingly I find no conflict with Policy BE35 of the Hull City Plan 2000. This policy seeks for signage to avoid clutter and to be sensitively designed and located in relation to the building and surrounding area. Furthermore I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it seeks to control advertisements in the interests of amenity whilst taking account of cumulative impacts.
11. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is allowed. In doing so I note that no non-standard conditions have been proposed and I consider that none are necessary.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR