



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/Z/19/3227920

Unit 5, Northwich Retail Park, Manchester Road CW9 5LY

- 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 Costa Ltd against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01079/ADV, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is retrospective application for two no. illuminated fascia signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed express consent is granted for two no. illuminated fascia signs 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 and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the signs permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 250 candela.
 - 2) The sign permitted by this consent shall only be illuminated during the opening hours of the premises to which it relates.

Procedural Matter

2. It was evident from my site visit that both signs are already in place and I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, the National Planning Policy Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance all confirm that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located within a retail park to the east of Northwich town centre. The retail park consists of a terraced of eight two storey units, a large two storey detached warehouse unit and a central carparking area. Access is provided from the A559 Manchester Road to the south and into the

north eastern corner of the site from the Denton Drive. The appearance and design of the existing fascia's and signage varies, although all of the existing signs within the retail park are large and generally commensurate with the scale of the building they are on.

6. The appeal building appears to be a later addition to the retail park, it is a modern single storey detached unit of a much smaller scale than the other units. It sits on the eastern end of the terrace and is set back approximately 15 metres. The building is dual aspect, with the front elevation overlooking the carpark towards Manchester Road and the side elevation looking east towards Denton Drive. Due to its positioning and smaller scale the appeal building is generally far less prominent in the context of the wider retail park.
7. The appeal relates to two illuminated fascia signs. One is located on the side elevation and the other is attached to the eaves on the front elevation; thereby projecting above roof level. The Council has raised no objection to the sign on the side elevation and I have no reason to disagree with this finding. The Council has, however, raised an objection to the sign that is located on the front elevation.
8. The fascia sign in this appeal is much smaller than the neighbouring examples. This is even when considered in the context of the lesser-scale host building where the sign is proportionately far smaller than other examples within the retail park. I acknowledge that the sign is located on the roof of the building rather than on the front elevation. However, the combined height of the host building, and the sign combined is only around half of the height of the neighbouring building. Consequently, it does not appear overly prominent or incongruous in the context of the host building or the retail park.
9. The signs are internally illuminated. However, the main parties are in agreement that the illumination of the signs will be restricted to a maximum of 250 candela per square metre during operational hours. I am therefore satisfied that illumination of the signs will not be obtrusive.
10. During my site visit I was able to view the signs from a number of locations within the Retail Park and from the surrounding area, I am satisfied that they do not appear over dominant or incongruous within the area. Accordingly, they have not caused any significant harm to the amenity of the area.
11. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material. Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part One) promotes high quality design and construction. Retained Policy BE16 of the Vale Royal Local Plan and emerging Policy DM17 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two) both seek to control advertisements in the context of amenity and public safety. As such, these policies are material in this case. I have concluded that the proposal would not harm the amenity of the area, and therefore would not conflict with these policies.

Conditions

12. I have imposed one condition relating to the intensity of illumination and a further condition which restricts the lighting of the sign to the hours of opening.

These conditions are considered necessary in order to preserve the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Julie Hunter

INSPECTOR