



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2022

by C Harding BA(Hons) PGDipTRP PGCert MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/Z/22/3294410

Path To The Front Of 3 Hereward Cross, Broadway, Peterborough PE1 1TA

- 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 Ms Bella Noakes on behalf of British Telecommunication PLC against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01392/ADV, dated 23 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is two digital 75 inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the amended InLink unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and advertisement consent is granted for two digital 75 inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the amended InLink unit, at Path To The Front Of 3 Hereward Cross, Peterborough, PE1 1TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01392/ADV, dated 23 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision, and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposed signage would be displayed on a hub unit. This structure does not currently exist. I understand that a planning application was made for the proposed hub, and that planning permission was refused. I can confirm that I have had regard only to the proposed advertisement and the appeal before me made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposed advertisements would be located on a hub unit, within a paved area of public realm on Broadway, and would replace a pair of existing telephone boxes. The area immediately surrounding the location includes a metal bench, lampposts and signage, bollards, cycle racks, junction boxes and several bus stops which contain digital advertising of their own. There are also several mature trees interspersed within this street furniture. The centre of Broadway forms the boundary of Peterborough City Centre Conservation Area (PCCCA), with the appeal site being located outside of it.

5. 8-14 Broadway is a Grade II listed building of ashlar stone construction and of plain classical design located opposite to the appeal site, across Broadway, and within the PCCCA. This building, along with others on the same side of Broadway emphasises the historic status of this thoroughfare. Key landmark buildings and the historic street pattern contribute to the character of the PCCCA.
6. The presence of these heritage assets does not prevent the display of well-sited signs of suitable size and design, particularly in mainly commercial areas. However, a strict control needs to be maintained to ensure that outdoor advertisements do not undermine the objectives of preserving or enhancing the character of conservation areas.
7. The boundary of the PCCCA is stark in this location, with Broadway having clearly differing characteristics on either side it. Whilst buildings on both sides of the street are generally in commercial use, those within the PCCCA are largely older in construction and more traditional in appearance than those on the opposite side. The Peterborough City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2017) recognises that the eastern side of Broadway offers little in the way of historic interest, it having previously been largely cleared to make way for more modern development.
8. Broadway is busy, but it is also a wide street and has an open nature as a result. The proposed advertisements would be illuminated, have a changing display and contribute to an already busy streetscene. However, existing signage on commercial buildings and the presence of street furniture, including other illuminated advertisements, means that they would not stand alone, nor appear unduly prominent. Any impact would also be partially mitigated and softened, to an extent, by existing mature trees.
9. Furthermore, as the proposed advertisements would be located on the eastern side of the street, they would be viewed largely in the context of the modern development to which they would more closely relate. Consequently, they would not result in harm to the general characteristics of the locality, including features of historic interest.
10. Park Conservation Area (PCA) lies further to the north, with its southern boundary crossing Broadway in the vicinity of Peterborough Central Library. Whilst Broadway forms an approach to PCA, there is significant distance between the appeal site and this boundary. In addition, the presence of intervening existing development means that whilst the proposed advertisements would be visible from within the PCA and would be present in views along the length of the street, they would not appear as unduly prominent or obtrusive.
11. Accordingly, I consider that the amenity of the area would not be harmed.

Other matters

12. I have taken account of concerns raised in representations relating to highway safety. However, the Council are satisfied that the proposed advertisements would not pose a risk to public safety, and I have not been presented with any substantive evidence that would lead me to a different conclusion.
13. The content of the advertisements and whether it comprises public information or commercial advertising, or in what proportions, is a matter which falls

outside of the scope of this appeal, as does the ability of the proposed hub to provide wi-fi access. As a result, I have not afforded any weight to these factors.

14. I conclude that the proposed advertisements would not be harmful to the amenity of the area. I have taken into account Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan which together, and amongst other factors, seek to ensure proposals positively contribute to the area, conserve and enhance the setting of heritage assets, and so are material in this case.
15. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies, nor would there be conflict with Paragraphs 197, 199 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

C Harding

INSPECTOR