

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 8 DECEMBER 2016

PART 2

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

| | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------|
| REFERENCE NO - 16/507069/ADV | | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Advertisement consent for 5 x non-illuminated pole mounted sponsorship signs. | | | |
| ADDRESS Advertisement on roundabout at Sonora Way/Jacinth Drive, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 5SN | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION – Approve | | | |
| SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposal would not give rise to significant harm in terms of highway safety and convenience, and would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene. | | | |
| REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection. | | | |
| WARD The Meads | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bobbing | APPLICANT Marketing Force Limited AGENT N/A | |
| DECISION DUE DATE 22/11/16 | PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 21/10/16 | OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 25/10/16 | |
| RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites): | | | |
| App No | Proposal | Decision | Date |
| None relevant | N/A | N/A | N/A |

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 This modestly sized roundabout forms a junction between Sonora Way, Jacinth Drive, Cinnabar Drive and Quartz Way. It is the main route into and out of The Meads ward.

1.02 There is landscaping on the roundabout, although it is clear at the entry points with good visibility.

1.03 The street scene is typical of a built up, residential location.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.01 The proposal seeks advertisement consent for the erection of 5 non-illuminated pole mounted signs at each entry onto the roundabout.

2.02 They would measure 0.87m in maximum height x 1.219m in maximum width.

- 2.03 The signs would display Kent County Council at the top and would allow sponsors to display company names, logos, short messages and contact details as part of a roundabout sponsorship programme.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 None relevant

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): The NPPF and NPPG are relevant in that they encourage good design and seek to minimise the impact of advertisements on public safety and amenity.
- 4.02 Development Plan: Saved policies E1, E19 and E23 of the adopted Swale Borough Council Local Plan 2008 and policies CP 4, DM 14 and DM 15 of the emerging Swale Borough Council Local Plan Bearing Fruits 2031 are relevant in that they relate to general development criteria and design and the impact of advertisements on safety and amenity.
- 4.03 Supplementary Planning Documents: The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "The Design of Shopfronts Signs & Advertisements" is also relevant, and remains a material consideration having been through a formal review and adoption process. It was adopted by the Council in 1993 after a period of consultation with the public, local and national consultees, and is specifically referred to in the supporting text for saved policy E23 of the Local Plan. It therefore remains a material consideration to be afforded substantial weight in the decision making process.
- 4.04 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 4.05 The NPPF was released on 27th March 2012 with immediate effect, however, para 214 states "that for 12 months from this publication date, decision-makers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework."
- 4.06 The 12 month period noted above has now expired, as such, it is necessary for a review of the consistency between the policies contained within the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 and the NPPF.
- 4.07 This has been carried out in the form of a report agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel on 12 December 2012. Saved policies E1, E19 and E23 are considered to accord with the NPPF for the purposes of determining this application and as such, these policies can still be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 2 residential representations objecting to the proposal have been received, raising the following summarised issues:
- Concern for the safety of the public, especially children
 - The roundabout is already dangerous as people drive too fast around it

- Nobody, especially children can see what is coming as you try to cross it
- Drivers will be distracted and may not notice someone, especially children, trying to cross the road
- There can be nothing so important to advertise, or any income great enough, to compromise pedestrian and road users safety

5.02 The Sittingbourne Society objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The roundabout carries heavy volumes of traffic and the signs would be a dangerous distraction to drivers negotiating them. Nor will the signs improve the appearance of the town

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 **Bobbing Parish Council** objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Foliage has previously been lowered due to issues with visibility, the signs will exacerbate this and add to the hazard

6.02 **Kent County Council Highways & Transportation** raise no objection to the proposal

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 The application reference to which this proposal refers to is 16/507069/ADV.

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The application site is within the defined built up area boundary in which the principle of development is acceptable. The main considerations in this case are the impact of the proposal upon highway safety & convenience and visual amenity.

Highway Safety & Convenience

8.02 I note the concerns regarding highway safety. However, KCC Highways & Transportation have considered the proposal and raise no objection. The roundabout is modestly sized but with clear visibility at each entry point. In my view, the allocated pedestrian crossing points at each junction provide a clear and safe route through the roads surrounding the roundabout, which would not be impacted by the development.

8.03 Furthermore, the signs would be relatively low in height and at least 1m away from the roundabout edge. They would be lower than the majority of the foliage already in situ. They would also be of a black, non-intrusive design. As such, I consider that there would be no serious distraction to drivers or pedestrians, and despite the concern raised, take the view that there would be no serious concern in terms of highway safety and convenience.

Visual Amenity

8.04 I take the view that the signs would be acceptably designed and given their low level form and the large size of the roundabout, I believe that they would not amount to dominant or intrusive features in the street scene, and would comfortably amalgamate with the character of the urban nature of the main road.

- 8.05 While I accept the view that the signs themselves would not necessarily improve the appearance of the area, I do not believe that they would be significantly harmful so as to warrant refusal of advertisement consent.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 Taking into account all of the above, I do not consider that the signs would give rise to serious concern in terms of highway safety & convenience or the visual amenity of the area, and recommend that advertisement consent be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT subject to the following conditions:

- (1) No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.
- (2) No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to:
 - (a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);
 - (b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or
 - (c) hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.
- (3) Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.
- (4) Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.
- (5) Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Regulation 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisement) (England) Regulations 2007.

- (6) No advertisement shall be illuminated.

Reason: In the interests of the highway safety and the amenities of the area.

- NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.
The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.