
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/16/3158057

Lidl Store, 174 Selby Road, Halton, Leeds, LS15 0DL

- 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 James Hanna against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03616/ADV, dated 7 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1x duo-post store-mounted 2.5m x 2.5m Lidl signage and 1x Lidl 7.5m pylon signage.
-

Decision

1. That part of the appeal that relates to the 1x duo-post store-mounted 2.5m x 2.5m Lidl signage is dismissed. That part of the appeal that relates to the 1x Lidl 7.5m pylon signage as applied for is allowed and express consent granted for its display. 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposed signs would replace existing signage at the store. The existing signs front onto Selby Road, and were recently consented under application ref 16/00174/ADV.
 4. The proposed store-mounted sign would have a similar design to the existing sign, but would be mounted on poles that would be around a metre taller. At present, the top of the existing sign is level with the top of the store roof, and it is not unduly intrusive within the street scene. However, the proposal would significantly elevate this sign and raise it above the height of the roof. This would create a much more imposing sign that would be excessively tall in relation to the existing store. It would be awkward in appearance and intrusive in the local context.
 5. Whilst the site is not within a conservation area and would not affect the setting of a listed building, that does not alter my view in this regard. Similarly, whilst there is no local design guidance for Halton Town Centre, that is not unusual, and it does not dilute the consideration of visual amenity in this case. Furthermore, there is no evidence before me that the proposed store-
-

mounted sign is necessary in order to adequately promote the store to existing and potential customers, and this did not appear to be the case on my site visit.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed store-mounted sign would unacceptably harm the visual amenity of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014), Policy BD8 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') relating to advertisements.
7. Turning to the proposed pylon sign, this would be around 1.5 metres taller than the existing sign in this position. It would be located in a more open part of the town centre next to the store car park and close to a major road junction. The proposed sign would be comparable in height to the nearby trees and lighting columns within the store car park. In the context in which it sits, the proposed additional height would not be unduly harmful in my view. Given the presence of an existing sign in this location, I also do not consider that the proposal would lead to unacceptable visual clutter. Furthermore, given the dissimilarity between this site and the remainder of the town centre, I do not consider that the sign would set a precedent for similar advertisements elsewhere.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed pylon sign would not have any unacceptable effect on the visual amenity of the area. It would therefore accord with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014), Policy BD8 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), and guidance in the Framework relating to advertisements.

Other Matter

9. Whilst no objections were received to either the original planning application or subsequent appeal, that does not alter the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the 1x duo-post store-mounted 2.5m x 2.5m Lidl signage would be detrimental to the interests of amenity, but that the display of the 1x Lidl 7.5m pylon signage would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR