



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2021

by R W Allen B.Sc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/Z/21/3274422

Wm Morrisons Supermarket Plc, Lincoln Road, Peterborough, PE4 6WS

- 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 Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00101/ADV, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 x Pylon disk drive thru arrow sign (illuminated)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of the 1 x Pylon disk drive thru arrow sign (illuminated). 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 condition:
 - 1) On commencement of the totem sign hereby granted express consent, the totem sign granted express consent under planning reference 20/00918/ADV shall not be commenced or implemented.

Preliminary Matter

2. I note from the application form that the address of the site is referred to as "Wm Morrisons" whereas the appellant is "Wm Morrison". It is not obvious whether it was the intention of the appellant to use both forms, and whether one is in fact incorrect. I have, therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, used both in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

4. The proposed signage would be positioned between the Starbucks Drive-Thru and the public footpath alongside Lincoln Road, on land which forms buffer planting between the two. A short distance from this location, which the Council equates to be 15m, is an existing totem sign which displays signage for Morrisons, McDonalds and Starbucks; all of whom occupy the retail park.
5. As pointed out by both main parties, advertisement consent exists for a similar totem sign¹ as the one before me in a location further towards the access road leading into the retail park, adjacent to the existing petrol filling station. Thus,

¹ Planning reference 20/00918/ADV

the Council is not concerned with the proposed advertisement per se, or indeed the resultant quantum of signage at this retail park. I concur. The appeal thus turns on whether the location of the proposed sign is too close to the existing totem, thus leading to visual clutter.

6. I note that the proposed advertisement and the existing totem pole would not be too distant from one another. However, this would only really be apparent when approaching from the south. Having viewed the site from various points along this approach, I am satisfied that the gap would be sufficient and that the proposed advertisement would sit comfortably alongside the existing totem sign. As both would only be viewed against the backdrop of the McDonalds unit and the wider retail park, the proposed and existing signs would not appear prominent and would not amount to visual clutter even when illuminated. My judgement is not altered by having viewed the appeal site from the north. That the existing totem sign already contains the Starbucks sign and whether this ought to be sufficient is not a matter I can comment on.
7. The appellant has offered to accept a condition preventing the signage approved under a previous consent from being implemented in the event I allow the appeal. I concur that such a condition is necessary to allow the Council to regulate the control signage in this locality.
8. I therefore find the proposed advertisement would not result in visual clutter and would not harm visual amenity. I have taken into account Local Plan² policy LP16, which seeks to protect amenity and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with this policy.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

R W Allen

INSPECTOR

² Peterborough Local Plan 2016