
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2021

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/Z/20/3260849

Land at Bargain Farm, Frogmore Lane, Nursling, Southampton SO16 0XS

- 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 Great Britain Ltd against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00883/ADV, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is freestanding Lidl 'flag style' sign at junction of Frogmore Lane and Brownhill Way.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisement 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 sign permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 440 candela per square metre (cd/m).
 - 2) The sign permitted by this consent shall only be illuminated during the opening hours of the premises to which it relates.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the
3. proposed advert on the visual amenities of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site for the advert lies on the outer edge of the car park to a Lidl foodstore which was under construction but close to completion at the time of my site visit. The site adjoins the urban area and the remaining areas of adjoining agricultural land are also due to be developed. A short distance to the west and also along Brownhill Way lies a Lidl distribution centre.
5. The foodstore has a number of other advertisements in situ which were approved under separate consents, including signs just above the eaves height of the building.
6. The advert had been partly constructed prior to my site visit. The illumination and other signage face had yet to be installed but the main structure and one side were visible and made the assessment of the visual impact much simpler.

7. It is the only freestanding advert away from the building and sits in a logical position close to a road junction. It is clearly within the car park of the store and provides a useful way marker for prospective shoppers to prompt a turn from the signalised junction. Whilst the area is not dominated or proliferated by signage, the advert is seen in the context of a number of signal heads, highway lighting columns and other signage, including that of the nearby leisure premises. It is not unduly prominent and is of an appropriate overall height and scale, relative to the building and the other signs that are present nearby. For these reasons, it does not appear an alien addition within its setting.
8. Whilst the area is currently transitioning from urban edge to part of the urban area, the advert is already surrounded by both residential and commercial development. Furthermore, there is also some degree of consistency with the signage in the area given that the store and the nearby distribution centre are part of the same overarching business and carry the same branding. This helps to minimise the effects of varying sized signs with differing colour schemes, pictures and lettering styles that can otherwise contribute to visual clutter.
9. Overall, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed advert would not harm the amenity of the area. It does not therefore conflict with Policies SDP1, SDP7, SDP9 or SD24 of The City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) or saved Policy CS13 of The Southampton Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) which seek to ensure that development proposals, including advertisements, are not detrimental to visual amenity.

Conditions

10. In allowing the appeal I shall impose two conditions in addition to the five standard conditions. Conditions to limit the intensity of the illumination, and to restrict the period of illumination to the opening hours of the store will serve to safeguard the amenity of the site and its surroundings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR