



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/Z/19/3233598

Giltbrook Retail Park, Ikea Way, Giltbrook, NG16 2RP

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Page of Insite Poster Properties Ltd against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00273/ADV, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as "*erection of two digital advertising displays*
 - *Display of illuminated static images on a 10 second sequential rotation.*
 - *No special effects including animation, flashing, or fading.*
 - *Illumination: Display will monitor and adjust to ambient light levels. Day max 600 candela/sqm. Night max 300 candela/sqm.*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of an area of landscaping at the entrance to a large retail park. It is located on a busy roundabout and next to an existing totem sign which identifies the outlets within the retail park.
4. The proposal would introduce a LED screen alongside the existing totem sign. This would be a large feature, mounted on a 3 metre high monopole support, that would have a total width of almost 7 metres. Its LED screen would give it a high level of prominence in the surrounding area and it would be visible in longer views from several directions. It would be significantly wider than the existing totem sign and would have an awkward relationship with it. In combination with the existing sign, it would create a large expanse of tall advertisements that would be dissimilar from any nearby feature. In my view, it would be an excessively large and discordant feature that would harmfully dominate the surrounding area. The fact that the proposal would be seen in the context of the retail park behind it does not overcome my concerns in this regard.
5. Whilst there are other advertisements and signs in the vicinity attached to commercial properties, those are generally smaller in size and are set back

significantly from the road. They are of a separate character to the appeal proposal and do not lend support to it.

6. My attention has also been drawn to a 2013 appeal decision¹ that permitted the widening of the existing totem sign. However, that proposal was for the extension of an existing sign, which is not the case here. I have therefore come to my own view on the current proposal based on the information before me and my own observations on site.
7. Whilst Planning Practice Guidance indicates that larger signs may be more appropriate in commercial areas, in this case, I consider that the scale and position of the proposed advertisement would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/J3015/H/13/2192956