

# **Development Control Committee**

## **1 November 2023**

### **Late Paper**

**Item 6 – DC/23/1101/ADV – Planning application – Advertisement consent – a. one internally illuminated fascia sign b. two non-illuminated window graphics 3. One non-illuminated customer board d. one internally illuminated totem**

**The Cooperative, Hepworth Road, Stanton**

**Case Officer – Amey Yuill**

1. Following publication of the report in respect of the above application, a neighbour representation has been received from No.1 Horseshoe Rise, which is adjacent to the site, to the north east, which states:

“With reference to the tall bright green illuminated coop sign on the edge of the car park, which is on from 7am to 10pm, I would like to complain that this is very intrusive to our property. It is approx 3 metres high which shows far above our garden wall and can be seen from our lounge and conservatory. I’m sure you can imagine that it is most unpleasant to have to constantly see this bright green illumination. Please can you direct me to the correct department (if not you) to make an official complaint and to request it be removed. I would be happy if someone wants to come to my house to see how it impacts on us.

I do not see that it is necessary for this tall coop sign to be there. The coop shop is very obvious from the road.

It may seem trivial to some but it is having a detrimental effect on me.”

2. Reflecting on the representation and the strength of this objection, and noting officers are required to have regard to representations which are received in reaching a recommendation, and further noting that DM2 and DM38 require proposals not to have adverse impacts upon amenity, officers consider that an expansion of the recommended reason for refusal is warranted. The totem sign is prominently sited relative to nearby residential dwellings, and will be visible in outlook from nearby homes and gardens, with its illuminated nature materially and adversely affecting amenity. It is not considered that limiting the hours of illumination will address these concerns.

3. It is therefore deemed appropriate to expand upon the recommended reason for refusal, as follows:
  1. Policy DM17 applies in relation to all proposals within, adjacent to or visible from a Conservation Area, and states that new shop fronts, fascias, awnings, canopies, advertisements and other alterations to commercial premises must be of a high standard of design which respects the character of the Conservation Area and the building to which they relate. Standardised shop fronts, unsympathetic 'house' signs, projecting box signs, internally illuminated signs and externally lit signs will not normally be granted consent. Where it can be demonstrated that premises rely principally on trading after dark externally illuminated signs sympathetic to the character of the building and the surrounding area may be permissible.

The proposed fascia sign and totem sign are both internally illuminated. The internal illumination is considered to neither preserve nor enhance the character of the adjacent Conservation Area, from which the store and its signage is readily visible from. Furthermore, with the site being well lit by other forms of illumination which already exist there is no justification provided as to why the internal illumination of the signage is required to support the trading of the business, resulting in a clear conflict with policy DM17.

Furthermore, policies DM2 and DM38 seeks to ensure that development, including advertisements, does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, nor the amenities of the wider area. The totem sign is prominently sited relative to nearby residential dwellings and will be visible in outlook from nearby homes and gardens, with its illuminated nature materially and adversely affecting amenity, contrary to these policies.

The proposed internally illuminated fascia and totem signs are therefore deemed to conflict with policies DM2, DM17 and DM38 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, as well as to paragraph 136 of the NPPF, to a level which warrants the refusal of the advertisement consent for these signs.