|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **East Area Planning Committee** | 16th April 2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Number:** | 13/00136/CT3 |
|  |  |
| **Decision Due by:** | 26th March 2013 |
|  |  |
| **Proposal:** | Installation of 2 x non-illuminated free standing signs at the entrance of the Football Ground |
|  |  |
| **Site Address:** | Oxford City Football Ground Court Place Farm Marsh Lane Oxford |
|  |  |
| **Ward:** | Marston Ward |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agent:**  | N/A | **Applicant:**  | Oxford City Council (Leisure) |

**Recommendation:**

APPLICATION BE APPROVED

For the following reasons:

 1 The advertisements are not considered to be visually intrusive in their context or to harm the visual amenity of the area, there is considered to be no material effect on highway safety and the proposal complies with policies CP1, CP8 and RC14 of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001 - 2016 and policy CS18 of the Core Strategy.

 2 The Council considers that the proposal accords with the policies of the development plan as summarised below. It has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and publicity. Any material harm that the development would otherwise give rise to can be offset by the conditions imposed.

Subject to the following conditions, which have been imposed for the reasons stated:

1 Five year time limit

2 Develop in accordance with approved plans

3 Advert - Statutory conditions

**Main Local Plan Policies:**

**Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016**

**CP1** - Development Proposals

**CP10** - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs

**RC14** - Advertisements

**Core Strategy**

**CS18\_** - Urban design, town character, historic environment

**Other Material Considerations:**

National Planning Policy Framework

**Representations Received:**

8 Nicholas Avenue – comments relate to the contents of the advert and that only ‘OXSRAD’ is advertised.

**Statutory and Internal Consultees:**

Drainage Team Manager – no comments

Highways Authority – no objection

Marston Parish Council – no comments

**Issues:**

Visual impact

Highway safety

**Officers Assessment:**

Site

1. The application site comprises the entrance to Court Place Farm Sport and Leisure Centre, on Marsh Lane in Marston.

Proposal

1. Advertisement consent is sought to erect 2 free-standing signs, one on either side of the entrance. The signs would measure approximately 3.1 metres in height from ground level and 0.92 metres in width. The signs would not be illuminated.

Visual impact

1. Policy RC14 of the Local Plan states that advertisement consent will be granted for outdoor advertisement proposals that:
* suit their visual setting in terms of scale, design, appearance and materials;
* preserve or enhance the visual amenity of the building; and
* do not significantly prejudice highway safety or residential amenity
1. The adverts would replace the existing 6 signs that are currently at the entrance to the site. Replacing these with two new signs would reduce the clutter and would be a positive improvement to the visual amenity of the area.
2. The signs are quite large, particularly the height, but as they mark the entrance to the site they need to draw the eye and as they are set back from the highway they would not appear unduly overbearing.
3. The nearest residential properties are sited some distance away so there would be adverse impact on residential amenity.
4. The advertisements do not contain any moving or flashing parts and are set back from the highway so would not give rise to any danger to highway safety.
5. One letter of objection was received but this related to the contents of the advert which the objector found to be misleading. This is not a planning consideration.

**Conclusion:** approve subject to conditions

**Human Rights Act 1998**

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions. Officers have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is proportionate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest. The interference is therefore justifiable and proportionate.

**Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998**

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to approve, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

**Contact Officer:** Rona Gregory

**Extension:** 2157

**Date:** 28th March 2013