

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/Z/17/3171224

Sainsbury's Sutton, 287A High Street, Sutton, Surrey SM1 1LD

- 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 Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref B2016/75742/ADV, dated 28 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2017.
 - The advertisements proposed are: 1 x Car Park Totem (Sign T1) facing High Street measuring 1.94m x 5.1m; 1 x Car Park Totem (Sign T2) at the junction of Crown Road/High Street measuring 1.94m x 5.1m; and 1 x Pedestrian Totem (Sign T3) facing Crown Road measuring 0.62m x 1.5m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to 1 x Car Park Totem (Sign T1) facing High Street measuring 1.94m x 5.1m and 1 x Car Park Totem (Sign T2) at the junction of Crown Road/High Street measuring 1.94m x 5.1m.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to 1 x Pedestrian Totem (Sign T3) facing Crown Road measuring 0.62m x 1.5m and consent for the display of the advertisement as applied for is granted. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary matters

3. The Council has approved a total of 12 fascia and other signs under the same reference, but has refused advertisement consent for these 3 free-standing signs. The Council's decision notice and report refer to signs T1 and T2 being internally illuminated. The application form and the relevant drawing referenced on the decision notice (AP 0020 007A), however, state that these signs would not be illuminated and I have considered the appeal on that basis. Non-illuminated sign T3 was in place at the time of my site visit.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed signage on the visual amenity of the local area.
-

Reasons

5. Sainsbury's Sutton is a new supermarket which now forms part of the town centre shopping area. The main part of the building faces Crown Road and the car park is tucked away behind building frontages with access from High Street.
6. Sign T1 would be sited on High Street, near to the car park access and next to a new planting bed – within a row of planters along this side of High street which will over time provide a green and leafy character. Although also sitting next to a new multi-storey building, the totem sign would in many views up and down the street relate more strongly to the planters, blocking and breaking up views along the row. At 5m high, the sign would be out of scale with the more human scale of this landscaped part of the street. I agree that a sign is needed to mark the car park entrance, but consider that the sign proposed would be overly large and poorly sited so that it would unduly harm visual amenity.
7. Sign T2 would be sited near the junction of High Street and Crown Road, in an area which has been set out as a small and attractively landscaped square. It would, due to its central location and size, dominate this area, again to the detriment of visual amenity.
8. Sign T3 would be sited on the Crown Road frontage, by the supermarket's service access and near to the neighbouring residential area. Due to its modest size, lack of illumination and positioning within a wide area of pavement on an otherwise uncluttered frontage, it causes no significant harm to visual amenity.
9. I conclude that the 2 larger totem signs (T1 and T2) would unacceptably harm the visual amenity of the local area, but that the smaller sign (T3) does not cause any significant harm. In coming to these conclusions, I have had regard to Core Planning Strategy Policy BP12 and Site Development Policies Development Plan Document Policies DM1 and DM3, which aim to protect amenity.
10. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should not succeed in relation to the 2 larger totem signs but that advertisement consent should be granted for the smaller totem sign. As this sign is acceptably in place and is not illuminated, no conditions are needed in addition to the 5 standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR