

OFFICERS REPORT

Application No: Y17/0482/SH

Location: B & Q Park Farm Road Folkestone Kent CT19 5FJ

Proposal Display of four non-illuminated freestanding entry board signs, three non-illuminated freestanding trolley bay signs, one externally illuminated totem sign and four non-illuminated freestanding car park directional signs

ASSESSMENT

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 20.04.17

Applicable 8 week target date: 15.06.17

Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) or Planning Extension Agreement (PEA)? No

Is the application being determined after 26 weeks without a PPA or a PEA? No

SITE VISIT

Carried out site visit on 22.05.17.

The site and proposals were assessed from the public highway and the application site and the following key features noted as set out in the report below.

SITE

The application site is located in Park Farm Industrial Estate within the defined settlement boundary of Folkestone. The unit, previously occupied by B&Q, forms part of the industrial estate which is recognised as an established employment site on the Proposals Map of the Shepway District Local Plan Review. The Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Folkestone to Etchinghill Escarpment Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are located on the opposite/north side of Churchill Avenue. The application site comprises a retail (Class A1) unit containing 4,958 sq m (GIA) of retail floorspace over two floors, 1,068 sq m external garden centre, 827 sq m builder's yard and associated car parking.

HISTORY

The most relevant planning history in relation to this application is:

Y07/0396/SH - Display of an internally illuminated double-sided freestanding totem sign (re-submission of Y06/1307/SH). Refused.

PROPOSAL

Display of four non-illuminated freestanding entry board signs (signs 1-4), three non-illuminated freestanding trolley bay signs (Types 1-3), one externally illuminated totem sign and four non-illuminated freestanding car park directional signs (Signs A, D, E and G) as shown on submitted drawing no. 2032-PL06 Rev.A.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file. The main points raised are summarised below.

Folkestone Town Council were consulted on the application and raised no objection subject to the Highway Officer's concerns over illumination levels being addressed.

Kent Highways & Transportation (KHAT) were consulted and objected to the proposed maximum level of luminance of the proposed externally illuminated totem sign included in the proposal. Following the submission of an amended plan in response to their comments, KHAT have withdrawn their objection.

REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 19.05.17

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review saved policies: SD1 and BE1

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraphs 17 and 67

National Planning Policy Guidance

Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations

APPRAISAL

The NPPG identifies that Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 requires the Local Planning Authority to have regard to amenity and public safety when considering proposals for the display of advertisements. The NPPF requires that consideration is given to the location of advertisements, stating that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built (and natural) environment. Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that control of advertisements should only be exercised by the local planning authority if they have an appreciable impact and the assessment should consider the protection of amenity and public safety only. As a result, the main considerations in relation to this proposal for advertisement consent will be visual impact, neighbouring amenity and public safety.

VISUAL IMPACT

Saved policy BE1 requires all development to have a high standard of layout, design and choice of materials, while Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework recognises the negative impact poorly placed advertisements can have on the appearance of the built environment. In this regard, it is considered that given the size and relative location of the proposed signs within the application site, that only one non-illuminated car park directional sign (sign A), one non-illuminated trolley bay sign (Type 3), the four non-illuminated car park directional signs (Signs A, D, E & G) and the externally illuminated totem sign would have an appreciable visual impact on the streetscene of Park Farm Road and the surrounding area. It is considered that given that the other signage included in this proposal would be located within the application, would be non-illuminated and would be low in level and scale, that they would not bear a significant or visual impact. Despite their location to the south/front boundary of the application site facing the streetscene of Park Farm Road, it is considered that signs A, D, E, G and Type 3 are relatively low in scale, with the trolley bay sign (Type 3) proposed to stand at a maximum height of 3 metres, the proposed sign A would stand at 2.55m above ground level and signs D, E and G would stand at a maximum of 2.02m. In light of this, and

the fact that these signs are proposed as non-illuminated and would bear directional and information about the services and products offered by the new occupiers of the site, Bunnings Warehouse, it is considered that they are acceptable in design and would not bear a significant or detrimental visual impact on the application site or the surrounding area. It is considered that these advertisements are appropriately located for the directions and information they would provide and that the proposed signage would not create a negative visual impact.

Turning to the proposed totem advertisement, the proposal includes the recladding of an existing sign which stands at 6.01m above ground level in close proximity to Park Farm Road. It is noted that that planning permission for totem signage on the application site has been refused twice (references: Y06/1307/SH and Y07/0396/SH) however as the totem sign has been in place since 2008, it is considered that the physical works that constitute the existing sign are likely to be considered lawful. With regard to the proposed cladding of the totem sign, this includes the corporate colour scheme of Bunnings Warehouse and following consultation with Kent Highways & Transportation the proposed level of luminance has been reduced from 1,200 cd/m to 800 cd/m in accordance with the Institution of Lighting Engineers Technical Report Number 5 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements'. On this basis, KHAT's objection has been withdrawn and the visual impact of the proposed externally illuminated advertisement on the existing totem structure has been reduced. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 67 in terms of the placing of advertisements and their associated impact on the appearance of the built environment.

AMENITIES & SAFETY

Given that the proposed signage would be contained within the application site and would not overhang the public highway, in conjunction with the reduction in luminance following KHAT's initial consultation response, it is considered that the proposed signage would not present a significant or detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or an issue of public safety, which would be of principal concern to motorists and pedestrians using Park Farm Road immediately adjacent to the site.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to amenity and safety.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the above, it is considered the proposal is a sustainable development that complies with development plan policy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

HUMAN RIGHTS

I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view, the Assessment section above and the Recommendation represents an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) [and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties)] and the wider public interest.

Case Officer: Alex Kalorkoti

Report and draft decision notice completed and passed to senior officer.

Name: Alex Kalorkoti Position: Graduate Planning Officer Date: 09.06.17

Report and draft decision notice amended (if appropriate)

Name:

Position:

Date:

Senior Officer

Report not agreed. Details of further work required as follows:

Name: Robert Allan
14/06/17

Position: Major Projects Team Leader

Date:

Report and draft decision notice agreed and file passed to admin to issue decision.