SECTION '2' – <u>Applications meriting special consideration</u>

Application No : 15/01917/ADV **Ward: Darwin**

Address : Bristol Street Motors Ltd Sevenoaks Road Pratts Bottom Orpington BR6 7LP

OS Grid Ref: E: 545528 N: 163224

Applicant : Mr Gavin Bradford **Objections : YES**

Description of Development:

Four internally illuminated fascia signs and one part externally/part internally illuminated entrance sign

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Flood Zone 2
Flood Zone 3
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding
Local Distributor Roads
Local Distributor Roads

Proposal

The proposal will replace/supplement existing signage relating to the services offered at the site. Sign F listed within the submitted plans will be located inside the building and is not subject to advertisement consent.

Location

The site is situated adjacent to the A21 Sevenoaks Road, by a major roundabout which adjoins High Street Green Street Green, Old Hill and Cudham Lane North. The site contains a sales building and workshop and an open-air car park within which vehicles are displayed.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- no regard for area
- light pollution

- previous applications concerning the site are overdue
- there remain existing planning breaches at the site

Comments from Consultees

No technical Highways objections have been raised.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan

BE21 Control of Advertisements and Signs
T18 Road Safety

All other material considerations shall also be taken into account.

Planning History

The site is the subject of a considerable planning history, including recent enforcement investigations. However, since this application relates to advertisement consent and is stand-alone in substance, it is not considered that this matter has any bearing on other aspects of the application site.

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are whether the proposed signs are in keeping with the appearance of the surrounding area and whether it respects the amenities of neighbouring properties. A further consideration is the impact on pedestrian and vehicular safety.

The proposed signs will be situated on the outside of the main building within on the site which contains a salesroom. The proposed signs B, D and E are considered to be commensurate in scale and appearance with existing signage and it is not considered that these will undermine amenity. Sign A will surround the main entrance to the building and incorporate a large free flying overall. Despite its overall scale, it is not considered that this will appear unduly prominent and harmful to the amenities of the area.

However, the proposed internally illuminated flex box Sign C which will occupy a position to the eastern elevation of the building and comprise an internally illuminated 'flax box' with overall dimensions of 12.4m x 3.9m is considered to be excessive in scale and over-dominant within the surrounding streetscene. Given its size, design and location, it is considered that Sign C would result in an excess of advertising matter within the site, detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene of the area in general.

For the above reasons, a split decision is recommended.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file refs set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: SPLIT DECISION

CONSENT GRANTED IN RESPECT OF SIGNS A, B, D, E

Subject to the following conditions:

F01
F02 … signs (A, B, D and E)… … 300…

CONSENT REFUSED IN RESPECT OF SIGN C

For the following reason:

The proposed internally illuminated flex box sign (Sign C) would, by reason of its scale and design, result in an excess of advertising matter within the site, detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and of the area in general, and contrary to Policy BE21 of the Unitary Development Plan.