The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2017

by I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

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

Decision date: 10 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/Z/16/3163810
Sainsburys, 30 Mere Green Road, Sutton Coldfield B75 5BT

- 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 Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
- The application Ref 2016/07347/PA, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2016.
- The advertisements proposed are an internally illuminated totem sign (sign A), non-illuminated pedestrian totem sign (sign B), two internally illuminated wall mounted signs (signs D1 and D2) and two internally illuminated fascia signs (signs C1 and C2).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of two internally illuminated fascia signs (signs C1 and C2), 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 matter

2. Consent was granted by the Council for four of the six signs proposed. These were the internally illuminated totem sign (sign A), non illuminated pedestrian totem sign (sign B) and two internally illuminated wall mounted signs (signs D1 and D2). I have therefore only considered in this appeal the two signs that were refused express consent, namely the internally illuminated fascia signs (signs C1 and C2).

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework recognises that poorly placed adverts can have a negative impact on the appearance of the natural and built environment. The Sainbury's store is located within the Mere Green District Centre, which in the vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by spaciously set large buildings such as the Four Oaks Medical Centre, library and community centre. With generous open air car parking separating these buildings and the Sainsbury's store from each other, the area has a large scale, urban character.

5. The Sainsbury's store is a large single storey building. It has a tiled pitched roof with a low eaves height and Tudor style gables which serve to give it a reassuringly sympathetic suburban appearance. At present the north western

elevation of the roof facing Mere Green Road has the word 'Sainsbury's' spelt out in large separate internally illuminated letters. Set comfortably within the roof slope, well separated from a gable on either side, the sign is in keeping with the scale of the building and the area.

6. The two proposed internally illuminated signs would be positioned in sequence to the right of the existing sign and level with it. At 0.86m in height they would be the same height as the smaller lower case letters of the existing sign. With the proposed signs together measuring approximately 2.45m in width they would occupy significantly less than half the width of the existing sign. Their lettering and logos would also be considerably smaller than the Sainsbury's sign. As a result, notwithstanding the solid backgrounds of the proposed signs, they would be subservient in scale to the existing sign and the building and would not result in visual clutter. For these reasons, I therefore conclude that they would not harm the visual amenity of the building or area.

7. I have taken into account policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan and policy 3.14D of Birmingham Unitary Development Plan which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given that I have found that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies.

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should therefore be allowed. No conditions apart from the five standard conditions have been suggested and no other conditions are required.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector