

<b>APPLICATION NO: 13/01767/ADV</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mr Martin Chandler</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED: 12th October 2013</b>		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY: 7th December 2013</b>
<b>WARD: St Pauls</b>		<b>PARISH: None</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr John Henley	
<b>AGENT:</b>	No agent used	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Car Park, North Place, Cheltenham	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Various illuminated signs to the store and car park	

## Update to Officer Report

### 1. OFFICER COMMENTS

1.1. When assessing applications for advertisement consent, the two areas for consideration are visual amenity and public safety. Given that the site is prominently located within the central conservation area, visual amenity takes on a heightened importance.

1.2. The NPPF advises, at para 67 that:

*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.*

1.3. With this advice in mind, and with reference to the comments provided from the Conservation and Heritage team which are set out within the original officer report, officers are content with the two signs which advertise the word 'Morrisons' – one on the glazed atrium and one on the vehicular entrance to the multi-storey car park.

1.4. This leaves four proposed signs which officers have reservations over; the 'M' box sign facing Monson Avenue, the 'M' box sign on the consented clock tower, the proposed clock face above the store entrance, and the proposed totem sign located adjacent the vehicular access to the multi-storey car park.

1.5. It is considered that the proposed 'M' box sign facing Monson Avenue (which is 1.8 metres by 1.9 metres) relates poorly to the consented supermarket building. This sign will be viewed across the grounds of Dowty House and officers consider that it would be overly intrusive in this prominent location, 10 metres above ground level.

1.6. The 'M' box sign proposed on the clock tower is also considered to be unacceptable. Members will recall that the clock tower was a pleasing component of the approved scheme and in light of this, an advert which has an awkward and jarring relationship with the approved clock face is something that officers cannot support as it would be detrimental to the approved building.

1.7. The additional clock face that is proposed to the glazed atrium is also an addition that has frustrated officers, again due to the success of the approved tower. Officers cannot understand the logic of a building with two clock faces and have asked the applicant to provide additional justification on this point. Members will be updated accordingly.

1.8. The final sign to consider is the proposed totem sign located adjacent to the vehicular access of the multi-storey car park. Members will note from the original report that the

Conservation and Heritage Manager has advised that this sign is '*totally unacceptable*'. Although not explicitly stated within the comments, this concern relates to the height of the sign at 5.5 metres. This matter has been discussed with the applicant who has provided additional information regarding the sign, including the submission of a visual 'mock-up' of how the sign would sit in the street.

- 1.9. The rationale behind the height of the sign is due to the red brick wall which encloses the car park serving St. Margaret's Terrace; the totem sign is located behind this wall. The applicant has expressed a desire that the sign be read above the wall and this is understood by officers. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that a compromise position between protecting the amenity value of the conservation area whilst also allowing the supermarket to achieve their advertising needs should be sought. At the time of writing this updated report, officers were still in discussions with the applicant regarding this point and members will be updated further when these negotiations have been resolved.
- 1.10. Regarding public safety, it is not considered that any of the proposed signs will have an adverse impact.

## **2. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1. Discussions are ongoing with the applicant regarding the advertisements. Members will be fully updated once these negotiations are concluded. It is worth highlighting at this stage that split decisions can be issued when considering applications for advertisement consent and this may well be how the officer recommendation proceeds, given the reservations set out above.