DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0214/ADV – 1 The Boulevard

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 10/06/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is within an area of mixed character. Offices and a commercial parade are to the south with residential elsewhere. A dual carriageway runs north-south.

The application property is a long established petrol station with a supermarket kiosk. There is advertising on and around the premises and canopy forecourt, much of it illuminated.

The neighbour to the north is a residential property. This property has a single first floor window facing onto the petrol station site. It is top hung and its size indicates it is a secondary means of light to the front first floor bedroom.

A 2 metre close boarded fence demarks the shared boundary between the neighbour and the petrol station.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as retrospective application for the display of internally illuminated signs on Petrol Filling stations canopy fascia's and retention of existing totem sign on forecourt

The proposal consists of:

- 1 no. free standing double sided internally illuminated totem sign to measure (at maximum) 1.6 metres and 5.5 metres high
- 2 no. internally illuminated fascia signs onto forecourt canopy positioned some 4.6 metres above the ground to the base of the advert and 21.6 metres in length
- 2 no. internally illuminated fascia signs onto forecourt canopy positioned some 4.6 metres above the ground to the base of the advert and 8 metres in length

The plans state the illumination of the canopy fascia signs as 73cd/m2. The internal illumination of the totem sign is not specified.

All the adverts have been installed out on site prior to obtaining consent from the local planning authority, hence the application is retrospective.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

Various applications in the past approved adverts, the most recent being:

WB/10/055/ADV
Installation of two externally illuminated fascia signs, one internally illuminated sign and two non-illuminated wall mounted signs
Granted Consent 31-08-2010

WB/02/01155/ADV
Installation of replacement signage to all existing signs with a modified design (Retrospective)
Granted Consent 4-12-2002

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, CC6, BE1

Worthing Core Strategy
16

Worthing Local Plan 2003
H16, H18

Government Advice
PPS1, PPG19

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

West Sussex County Council Highways Authority comments:

Consulted previously on Highway Matters for this location under planning application no. WB/555/10 to which no objections raised

All proposed signage situated away from public highway and would not therefore have any consequences to users of the public highway. There would consequently be no objection to this proposal

One letter of objection received, content summarised below:

- *Greatly concerned if goes ahead, will further exacerbate already high levels of light that currently intrude onto my property and my ability to sleep.*
- *Really do not want another illuminated sign in full view and reflecting in my home*

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

The principle planning concerns with this development is its impact upon amenity (in particular visually and upon neighbours), and highway safety.

Visual

Whilst the development is an obvious feature in the street visually, the area is of mixed character with a commercial ambience. The scale, position, and branding design of the adverts are appropriate to a canopy forecourt of a modern petrol filling station.

Indeed the fascia signs are almost identical in their size to the previous adverts installed on the site when BP operated from the station.

The totem is 298 mm higher than the previous totem, but is 390mm slimmer. This is an improvement as its prominence comes from its 'slab' thickness rather than height, given its position alongside the much taller forecourt canopy.

For these reasons, there is not sufficient justification to withhold permission on visual grounds alone.

Neighbours

The level of illumination of the adverts applied for is 73 candelas per metre squared. This is far less intense than the illumination of the previous BP adverts, at 763 candelas per metre squared. That previous level of illumination was deemed acceptable in the previous approval WB/02/01155/ADV.

Government advice has not changed in the intervening time to suggest this degree of illumination is no longer within acceptable tolerance. The area of illumination of the fascias is not materially greater than the previous BP signage. And the hours of their illumination is to be restricted to 7am – 11pm, like the previous BP signs.

The totem sign has a slightly greater area of exposed illumination compared to the previous BP totem sign. But this sign is also a good distance from any immediate neighbour.

For these reasons no materially greater intrusive illumination would arise onto the neighbour compared to what was previously experienced. Indeed in many ways the level of intrusion has reduced.

Highway Safety

The level of illumination would not distract passing traffic and other road users, so the safety of the highway is not impinged upon.

The Highways Authority raises no objection from this point of view.

Conclusion

For the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon identified amenities. Therefore the application should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to:-

1. Standard 1- 5
2. Plans as approved
3. Illumination of all signage no greater than 73 candelas per metre squared
4. Fascia signs only illuminated between 7am -11pm each day and shall not be illuminated when the premises are closed for business.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal complies with relevant Development Plan policies, and the advice contained in PPG19.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

N/A

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 4/7/11 .....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 5/7/11 .....