



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019 by Hilary Senior BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

by J Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/Z/19/3234976

Queens Retail Park, Old Rickerscote Lane, Stafford, ST17 4SU

- 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 Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/30552/ADV, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Preliminary Matter

4. The Council have drawn my attention to Policy N1 of The Plan for Stafford Borough (2011-2031) (the LP) which they consider to be relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, powers under the Regulations¹ to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interest of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterates this approach. I have therefore taken Policy N1 of the LP into account insofar as it is relevant to those matters.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is adjacent to the A34 on the Queensville Bridge on an open grassed bank which forms part of the landscaped setting of the Queens Retail Park. Whilst the access road to the retail park and the commercial buildings

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended)

would form the backdrop to the proposed advertisement, this is some distance from the appeal site. The immediate vicinity is characterised by the openness of the grassed bank and the dense cover of trees.

6. The proposal is for a free-standing digital advertisement with static images on a 10 second sequential rotation. It would be supported by a monopole with an LED display measuring approximately 6m by 3m with an overall height of about 6.8m. As such, the advertisement display would be seen by traffic travelling along the A34 away from Stafford town centre.
7. Given the prominent location of the advertisement, the illuminated images would stand out, both during the day and at night. Whilst I recognise that the buildings and structures in the vicinity of the site are of a large scale, the size and regular changing of the display would draw the attention of road users and add to its prominence, even if the level of illumination was within recommended limits and if the speed and frequency of image transitions are controlled. As such the proposal would appear isolated from the closest commercial buildings and would thus dominate the street scene.
8. For the reasons set out, the proposal, by reason of its prominent location, illumination, height and size would be dominant and overbearing within the street scene. As such the proposal would harm the amenity of the surrounding area. In that respect the proposal is contrary to policy N1 of the LP which, although not decisive, seeks to ensure that new development takes account of the local context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

J Whitfield

INSPECTOR