



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th March 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/M1710/W/24/3351730

Sainsbury's, Midhurst Road, Liphook GU30 7TW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 33993/089.
 - The development proposed is siting of ancillary retail pod unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M1710/H/24/3351729

Sainsbury's, Midhurst Road, Liphook GU30 7TW

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 33993/090.
 - The development proposed is display of 3 illuminated signs and 10 non illuminated signs on ancillary retail pod unit.
-

Decision

1. Appeals A and B are both dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The descriptions of development are taken from the Council's decision notices as these accurately and clearly describe the act of development sought in each of these two appeals. These developments appear to have taken place, nevertheless, for clarity, this decision assesses the proposals on their planning merits.

Main Issues

3. The main issue for Appeal A is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
4. The main issue for Appeal B is the effect of the proposed development on amenity, with particular regard to the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is part of a Sainsburys car park. The existing retail store is a large building, which has a single storey appearance, wooden cladding, brick, lighter stone projecting wall features and a large pitched tiled roof. Illuminated signs are located on the three lighter walls. There is a car park on two sides and within this

area there are trolley shelters, fencing around a previous recycling area and modest low level signs for traffic and an illuminated totem sign at the entrance. As well as the parked and moving vehicles using the car park. There is also a petrol station at the edge of the car park with a single storey brick building which has an illuminated sign and large canopy with petrol pumps under. Vehicle access to Sainsbury's is via a curved entrance road from the roundabout. There are also pedestrian crossings providing routes to and from the store, including a series of zebra crossings from the store entrance to this roundabout.

6. The area has a distinct commercial character, with the store being the focal point with limited, modest paraphernalia around it resulting in a pleasant, uncluttered appearance to this location.

Appeal A

7. The pod is a single storey flat roof timber structure with glazed doors. It is located across four car parking spaces on the edge of the car park which are directly adjacent to the access road and next to the pedestrian route from the store to the roundabout.
8. The modest size of the pod including its flat roof design is ancillary in scale to the superstore with materials that are not out of keeping in the context of the wooden cladding to the main store. Furthermore, such structures are not uncommon in these settings.
9. However, the pod is in a highly prominent position, directly adjacent to the vehicle and pedestrian entrances. This location is convenient for pedestrians to access and provides footfall for the retail use. Nonetheless, its siting away from the main store results in its appearance as a standalone structure which is visually disconnected from the existing built form. Nor is it particularly close to the petrol station so that these buildings are visually connected. Whilst there is landscaping around the edge of the car park, the pod is seen from the surrounding roads, particularly through the access.
10. The pod therefore creates a distinct additional building and its siting results in the structure appearing highly prominent. Therefore the building is unacceptably dominant and results in a cluttered character to this commercial area which undermines this positive feature of this area.
11. My attention is drawn to an appeal for a retail pod which was allowed at Sainsbury's, Hythe (Appeal ref: APP/L2250/W/24/3340654). However, that pod would be located close to the store and therefore it is clearly different to the situation before me now.
12. Therefore the appeal scheme is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) (CS) which seeks exemplary standards of design and a high quality external appearance amongst other things. Appeal A conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

Appeal B

13. The signage on the pod includes two large signs that occupy the majority of the side elevations, two signs to the front which occupy a large portion of the part of the front elevation which is not glazed and six separate signs to the rear elevation. As well as illuminated signs which run the full length of the pod along three sides. The signage does not project beyond the surface of the building's walls.
14. Taking into account the modest size of the building to which the signage is attached, the size and number of the signs dominates the appearance in this area. The signage is smaller than the existing Sainsbury's totem sign. However, given their extent relative to the pod to which they are affixed, they overwhelm this building with advertising, resulting in the adverts having an unacceptably prominent and visually jarring appearance in this context.
15. Therefore, Appeal B would have an unacceptable effect on amenity with particular regard to the visual amenity of the area. I have taken into account policies CP29 of the LP and Policy HE3 of the EHDLP: Second Review (2006) which, in addition to the aims set out above, seek to avoid an adverse effect on character and appearance and so is material in this case. As the proposal harms amenity, it conflicts with these policies.

Conclusion

16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal A and B should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/M1710/W/24/3351730	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
Appeal B	APP/M1710/H/24/3351729	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd