



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2010

by **Michael R Moffoot** DipTP MRTPI
DipMgt MCMI

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:
4 May 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/H/10/2121251
9 Healaugh Park, Yarm, Cleveland TS15 9XN

- 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 Aldi Stores Ltd against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application Ref. 09/1435/ADV, dated 12 June 2009, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2009.
- The advertisement proposed is described as '1 no. double pole mounted sign to the front elevation of the store incorporated into the steel and glass canopy. 1 no. double pole mounted sign to the service yard.'

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant advised by letter dated 17 March 2010 that advertisement consent has been granted by the Council for the sign to the front of the store since the appeal was lodged. As a consequence, this element has been withdrawn from the appeal, and I shall therefore confine my considerations to the sign adjacent to the service yard.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the sign on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the edge of an enclave of commercial outlets within a predominantly residential area bordering the busy Thirsk Road on the south side of Yarm. The disputed sign is in place, and is situated on a landscaped verge adjacent to a service yard to the rear of the store at the junction of Canon Grove and Healaugh Park. It comprises a large 'Aldi' sign in the appellant's house style and a smaller 'showcase' sign containing the store opening times. Both signs are internally illuminated.
 5. Planning Policy Guidance 19: *Outdoor Advertisement Control* advises, amongst other things, that the scale and massing of existing structures and the predominant land use in a locality will be relevant considerations in advertising proposals, with colour, materials, proportion and illumination of signs also being relevant factors.
-

6. This is a substantial and prominent structure due to its size, bulk, height and siting. From a number of viewpoints on Thirsk Road and Canon Grove it is observed against a backdrop of the service yard and the associated store and adjoining shops. Nevertheless, I consider it has an assertive and intrusive presence in the street scene. From various vantage points on Thirsk Road and Healaugh Park, the sign is viewed in the context of housing development, and appears as a dominant and disproportionate feature that is incongruous in this residential environment. Its presence would be reinforced by internal illumination after dark during trading hours, which adds weight to my concerns.
7. I have taken into account other signs in the locality drawn to my attention, including post-mounted 'V-boards' at a dental surgery/children's nursery, and illuminated signs at a public house. However they are not of a comparable scale to the disputed sign and are not generally viewed in a residential context, whilst those at the petrol filling station do not constitute sympathetic signage on the urban fringe, and do not persuade me that the proposal should succeed.
8. Drawing these findings together, I conclude that the sign unacceptably imposes on the street scene, and thus detracts from the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Michael R Moffoot

Inspector