REF. NO.A/13/72567

ADVERTISEMENTS REPORT (re-written 30.07.13)

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Retention of 2no. Non illuminated free standing signs at front Quality And Caring DentistryBotley Road West End Southampton SO30 3HA

SITE VISIT DATE 17/06/13

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The sign measures 1.34m by 1.21m, be 0.6 from ground level and to a total height of 1.94m.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	No trees to be affected by the development
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	A mix of close boarded fencing and small shrubs to one side of the car park and hedging to the other.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow towards the rear of its plot with a large front car park.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Semi rural location, a few neighbouring houses but site set in countryside with west end town centre located nearby.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
A/05/55264	Display of 1no. free-standing non-illuminated sign	CAD 21/12/05

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUP	
OTHER	None

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection
Head of Transportation and Engineering	29.07.13 Holding objection. As the signs are over 0.9m in height, they will need to be outside of the access junction visibility splay. No plans demonstrating this have been submitted. Due to the relatively high

REF. NO.A/13/72567

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	number of movements in/out of the dentist, additional plans are therefore required, showing how an unobstructed visibility splay left and right from the dentist access junction are achievable to the required distances of 2.4m (into site) x 70.0m (along the highway) in accordance to DMRB. It is presumed that this is why the frontal hedges have been kept low, but now appears to be obscured by the sign. The signage itself is acceptable, but may need to be moved back into site to clear visibility Further comments: Please find attached a rough sketch demonstrating the required 2.4 x 43.0m visibility splay. As you will note, the sign appears to fall out of the splay and as such is in a sufficient location. However it should be noted that the measurements are taken from GIS (notoriously inaccurate) and Googlemap (rough sign location). As such, it may be that these plans are inaccurate, and it should really be for the applicant to produce correct plans. 30.07.13 The Boroughs Engineer has reviewed the information submitted and stated: Whilst the plan does not show the visibility splay, it does show some measurements which (particularly the sign measurement being 2.2m behind carriageway) when combined with the GIS information suggests that the location of the sign (whilst tight) is within an acceptable tolerance level of location in order to accord with MfS visibility requirements. i.e. it appears to achieve these, but if not its movement would be by an amount not material or to be honest noticeable – i.e. 10cm back into site which would be within variances of individual drivers choice as to where to stop and view the highway.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Strategic Within countryside

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 2.CO, 67.BE Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 S8, DM1

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework – Section 7 'Requiring good design'

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to visual amenity and highway safety.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

See below

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

n/a

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Regulation 3 (1)(2)(3) (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisement) Regulations 2007 states:-

"A local planning authority shall exercise their powers under these Regulations only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors, and in particular:

(a) **In the case of amenity, the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest, disregarding, if they think fit, any advertisement being displayed there;**

(b) **In the case of public safety:**
(i) **The safety of any person who may use any road, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome;**
(ii) **Whether any display of advertisements is likely to obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any road traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air.**

In determining an application for consent for the display of advertisements, or considering whether to make an order revoking or modifying a consent, the local planning authority may have regard to any material change in circumstances likely to occur within the period for which the consent is required or granted."

Section 7 of the NPPF – 'Requiring good design' provides guidance with regards to advertisements, stating:

Para 67 - Poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment. Control over outdoor advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Only those advertisements which will clearly have an appreciable impact on a building or on their surroundings should be subject to the local planning authority's detailed assessment. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

REF. NO.A/13/72567

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Policy 67.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) states that advert consent shall be granted provided it meets all the following criteria:

- it does not detract from the character of the locality and it is appropriate to its surroundings in terms of design, size, materials, colour, positioning and the extent of signage;
- if illuminated, the amount of illumination does not detract from the character of the locality,
- it does not create a risk to public safety; and
- the site is not in a Conservation Area, where policy 172.LB applies.

Policy DM1 of the pre-submission local plan provides general criteria for new development stating that development should enhance the character and appearance of the countryside.

Although there were concerns raised with regards to the scale and design of the sign in this rural green area, consideration is given to the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, Class 6 (5) that states that a single advertisement may not exceed 1.55sqm in area for signs displayed on a business forecourt. The advert under consideration has a total area of 1.62sqm. On this basis it is considered that due to the size allowed under permitted development, a reason for refusal cannot be justified on the grounds of scale and design as the difference in size is relatively minor.

The Head of Transportation and Engineering have requested that the applicant confirms that the sign is not located within the access junction visibility splay. The applicant has produced a plan and explanation of the site's visibility. The plan shows that the sign would be 2.2m from the edge of the highway and 2.34m from the centre point of the splay. The Head of Transportation and Engineering requested that the sign should be set back 2.4m and giving consideration to the minor shortfall in this distance has raised no objection.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

Recommend advert consent