Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2009

by Nigel Harrison **BA (Hons) MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
21 April 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/A/09/2096361
Tesco Store, 1 Hawley Road, Hinckley, LE10 0PR

- 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 Tesco Stores Ltd against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 08/01055/ADV dated 31 October 2008, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2008.
- The appeal concerns the display of a non-illuminated sign on the southern elevation.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural matter

2. The Council's decision was issued as a split decision, with consent given to a total of 27 signs located on the north elevation of the supermarket, on and around the petrol filling station, in the car park and elsewhere. However, consent was refused for the 'Open 24 Hours' fascia sign on the southern elevation, the subject of this appeal.

Main issue

3. I consider the one main issue is the effect of the sign on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The sign is in place and measures approximately 7.6m x 2.5m. It is non-illuminated and positioned close to the roofline on the southern elevation of the store. It is of similar depth and in line with an existing 'Tesco' store sign.

5. The store is located on the edge of the town centre, where mixed residential and commercial uses to the north of the railway give way to predominantly residential areas to the south. Due to the rising ground to the south, the sign is particularly prominent in views from Rugby Road, one of the main approaches to the town, and in views from the nearby recreation area. I also consider it creates a significant visual intrusion in the direct outlook from dwellings located to the south of the railway in East Close. Taken together with the approved signage at the store, I agree with the Council that it adds to the visual clutter of advertising material in this location, and that the cumulative effect is harmful to visual amenity.

6. I accept that when in leaf, the trees planted along the edge of the recreation ground would partly filter views of the sign from this direction. However, because of the height of the sign above ground level, the mitigating effect would be minimal in my view, and insufficient to overcome my concerns.

7. I conclude for these reasons that the display of the appeal sign is unacceptably intrusive in this mixed use, edge of town centre location, is detrimental to the general interests of amenity, and harms the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR