
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019 by John Gunn DipTP Dip DBE MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/Z/19/3235256

Land at Beaumont Retail Centre, Beaumont Way, Leicester LE4 1DS

- 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, Insite Poster Properties Ltd against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20190959, dated 10 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of a digital advertising display - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council indicated in the appeal questionnaire that the proposal would affect an ancient monument. It has since confirmed that this question was answered in error and has confirmed that the proposal does not affect an ancient monument.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the digital advertising display on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is at the entrance to a retail park and its associated car park and has a frontage onto Beaumont Way. The advertisement would lie within an area containing an existing totem sign, providing details of occupiers of the retail park, and several young trees and shrubs. To the east of the appeal site is a footpath that provides pedestrian access from the public highway to the retail park, beyond which lies another totem advertisement pole.

6. The proposed advertisement would sit 3 metres above ground level, measure 6 metres in width and be 3 metres in height¹. It would be located close to the 2 existing tall, totem signs. It would be illuminated during the day and in the evening, although the level of illumination would be reduced after dark. In this regard and given the context within which the advertisement would be displayed (with a car park and illuminated advertisements on the retail premises) the level of illumination would be acceptable.
7. However, the close proximity of the new advertisement to the existing would be likely to result in a coalescing of advertisement material presenting a wall of signage. The existing advertisements would no longer be viewed as single entities and the amount of advertisement material on the approach into the retail park would result in visual clutter.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear at paragraph 132 that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. In this case the siting of the new advertisement in relation to existing advertisement material would be poor and harm would occur to the visual amenity of the area.
9. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed advertisement would harm the visual amenity of the area. The provisions of the development plan, so far as they are relevant, have been considered. Since the proposed advertisement would cause visual harm to the street scene, the proposal would not meet with the aims of Policy CS03 of the Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy - Adopted July 2014, which seeks high quality design that responds positively to its surroundings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gunn

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR

¹ Figures taken from the application form