



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2011

by Elizabeth Fieldhouse DipTP DipUD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 June 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/H/11/2146315

**Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited, 30a Mulfords Hill, Tadley, Hampshire
RG26 7JE**

- 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 Limited against the decision of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref BDB/73326, dated 8 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2010.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of two non-illuminated sky signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The appeal signs were the part of an application for several signs the remainder having been granted consent and appeared to have been implemented. The Council identified the appeal signs as numbers 12 and 12a on drawing no.1841-PL (03) 2200. On drawing no. 1841-PL (03) – 5200, also considered by the Council and submitted with the appeal, the signs are annotated as 'Illuminated sky signs (1500 high)'. Although the appellants have described the development on the appeal form as two non-illuminated sky signs 1200mm by 7760mm, in view of the form of signage considered by the Council and shown on the submitted drawings, I shall determine the appeal on the basis of the sky signs being illuminated and 1500mm high.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the signs respect the character and appearance and thereby the amenity of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The sky sign facing Mulfords Hill appeared to have been installed, but it was not possible to confirm the signage was precisely that proposed. The mounting pillars for the eastern elevation sign project above the roof. The signs would be the company logo colour in upper and lower case and be mounted above the flat roof of the building. By projecting above the roof, the signage would diminish the perception of the long clean lines that top the building and harm the architectural integrity of the building. That on the Mulfords Hill frontage would be fairly close to and reduce the dominance of the raised structure that 'advertises' the entrance. The sky sign on the eastern elevation would stand

out above and detract from the roof line that, in itself, is well above the entrance canopies.

5. By reason of their height, illumination and scale, the proposed signs would harm the integrity of the building and thereby be unacceptably detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and area, harming amenity. It is necessary for a business to promote its presence but a sky sign is not necessary as demonstrated by the signage on the north elevation over the side entrance canopy.
6. Planning Policy Guidance 19 *Outdoor Advertisement Control* advises that the appearance of a good building can easily be spoiled by an insensitively placed sign or advertisement or by a choice of advertisement materials, colour, proportion or illumination which is alien to the buildings design or fabric. In this case the harm to the integrity of the building would be such that neither the advice in PPG19 nor the relevant provisions of policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011 would be met.
7. The signs may have a similar overall height to previous approved signage on an earlier application. Nevertheless, the proposed sky signs unacceptably diminish the roof lines and integrity of the erected building. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, the display of the advertisements proposed would be detrimental to the interests of amenity and the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR