

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/Z/16/3157758

New Road, Littlehampton, West Sussex BN17 5AX

- 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 Lidl UK against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref LU/128/16/A, dated 18 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated freestanding totem sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the signage on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a foodstore with car parking to the side. It is located close to the centre of Littlehampton in a predominately residential street comprising modest terraced houses. The foodstore is set back from the road behind trees. At upper level there is prominent signage and next to the pavement there is a modest non-illuminated sign. The proposal would involve the replacement of the latter with an internally illuminated double-sided totem sign measuring nearly 6m in height by just over 2m in width.
 4. The proposed totem sign would be evident in views looking west along New Road and would be seen against the backdrop of the trees and in the context of modest scale terraced housing. In my judgement, due to its size and siting, the proposed signage would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene that would be out of keeping with the predominately residential setting. I therefore conclude that it would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area.
 5. I recognise that the sign would be smaller than the appellant's standard format, the level of illuminance would be compatible with the location, the signage would not have an unacceptable effect on highway safety and there is no evidence of local opposition. I also note the appellant's offer to remove the signage on the building. However these matters are not sufficient to outweigh the concerns outlined above.
-

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR