

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

**by Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 8 March 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/Z/22/3306448**

**16 Bishops Place, West Hoe Road, Plymouth PL1 3BW**

- 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 Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
  - The application Ref.22/00956/ADV, dated 25 May 2022 was refused by notice dated 14 July 2022.
  - The advertisement proposed is the replacement of an existing 48 sheet advertisement board with an internally illuminated D-Poster.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. This is the impact of the advertisement display proposed on amenity.

## Reasons

3. The advertisement board proposed for replacement is placed on the gable end of a terrace that houses shops on the ground floor with accommodation above. It is a most conspicuous feature in views towards it from West Hoe Road. While advertisement boards of this sort are a common feature of urban areas, this particular example, because of its prominence, is a negative feature of the street-scene. As paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) tells us, the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly designed and sited.
4. It is proposed to replace this existing advertisement board with a digital screen of similar size which would display static advertisements on rotation. I appreciate that illumination levels of the digital screen could be controlled by condition and note that the appellant is willing to accept a condition limiting the hours of illumination so that the screen is turned off between 0000 hours and 0500 hours.
5. However, the screen would nevertheless be illuminated for a significant proportion of the day. Moreover, while the display would be static, it could change as often as every ten seconds. As a result of the illumination, and the regularly changing display, the prominence of the display in this location would increase, and with it the negative impact on the street-scene. The effect on amenity would be a significantly detrimental one.

6. The appellant has pointed to other illuminated signage in the area, but this is generally associated with the shops in the local centre. I do not regard the presence of illuminated shopfront signs, which are directly related to the shops they serve, as providing justification for general illuminated advertisements.
7. My attention has been directed towards benefits of the type of advertisement proposed through the reduction in vehicle trips for reposting, eradicating the need to print posters, the ability to broadcast emergency messaging, and so forth. However, I do not regard these benefits to be sufficient to outweigh the significant harm to amenity that would be caused.

### **Conclusion**

8. On that overall basis, the appeal fails.

Paul Griffiths

**INSPECTOR**