



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/Z/25/3363375
152 and 154 Eastgate, Louth LN11 9AB

- 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 for the display of an advertisement.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is N/105/01928/24.
 - The development is described as upgrade of existing 48 sheet advert to support digital poster.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terraced building with hot food takeaway on the ground floor located on the junction of Eastgate and Albion Place. A Morrisons store is adjacent the site fronting a roundabout serving Eastgate and Ramsgate. The area is a mix of commercial and residential uses, with the appeal site location at a gateway point leading into the main town centre.
4. The appeal site is located with the Louth Conservation Area near to three listed buildings, the Almshouses to the northeast, 146 Eastgate to the west and the war memorial also to the northeast. Both parties confirm that the area also contains non-designated heritage assets however I have not been provided with substantive details relating to this.
5. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act) requires decision makers, when considering whether to grant planning permission, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. A similar requirement applies to conservation areas under the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the LBCA Act where I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
6. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.

7. Advertisements in the immediate area are predominantly traditional fascia signs on shopfronts. Most are non-illuminated, many are traditional painted signs, which adds to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
8. There is an existing non-illuminated/non-digital advertisement of a similar size and location to the proposed advertisement on the gable of 152 and 154 Eastgate, I understand that this has been in-situ for a number of years. The advertisement is prominent in the streetscene and is not the typical advertisement in the area.
9. The proposed advertisement would comprise a 6m x 3m display with static advertisement image which would have the capability to change every 10 seconds.
10. A similar proposal to that before me was the subject of a dismissed appeal in 2021¹, notwithstanding this the appellant contends that the more recently approved Morrisons redevelopment² will significantly change the streetscene and illumination in the vicinity of the appeal site. From the information I have been provided I agree.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Louth Conservation Area Appraisal (2008) citing that “The supermarket on the corner of Eastgate ... do not respect the traditional grain of the area” and “The supermarket site on the southern side of Eastgate is however of lesser quality and has a rather dead frontage.” During my site visit I observed that the bland façade of Morrisons is not sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.
12. A modern and larger supermarket building with floodlit carpark at the Eastgate frontage has been approved, with the area to the front adjacent the appeal site as landscaping, whilst a new access would be formed and external lighting would be installed, this would be an improvement to the existing Morrisons façade.
13. The approved redevelopment would provide an open landscaped frontage which would soften the appearance of the car park beyond with the new supermarket tucked behind buildings on Eastgate. The appellant contends the approved landscaping would provide additional screening to the proposed advertisement and eventually soften the structure. I am not persuaded by this argument, as all advertisements are intended to attract attention³ and no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate how and within what timescale the landscaping would soften the structure.
14. Whilst there is an existing advertisement board, I find that the proposed digital advertisement would be materially different to the existing situation, as did the previous Inspector in the 2021 appeal. In this prominent location the illumination and changing images would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area and would be a dominant feature harming the conservation area and setting of the nearby listed buildings.
15. The appellant confirms that the maximum brightness will be within the guidelines set by the Institute of Lighting Professions Technical Note 5. Even so, the location, scale and changing digital image would be incongruous to the area.
16. In assessing amenity, I have taking into account the advertisements within the area. The previous Inspector found that the digital advertisement would stand in

¹ Ref: APP/D2510/Z/20/3265426

² Ref: N/105/01410/23

³ Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 067 Reference ID: 18b-067-20140306

stark contrast to the prevailing pattern of advertisement in the area, and that it would be conspicuous due to the digital display casing light outwards. I agree.

17. I conclude that the display of the digital advertisement proposed would be detrimental to the amenity of the area and would be an imposing addition to the conservation area.
18. I have taken into account Policies SP10 and SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan, Core Strategy, Supporting Economic Growth for the Future (2018) which amongst other things supports well designed development which respects the historic environment and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
19. I find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements.

Other Matters

20. The appellant has drawn my attention to other advertisements in the area in particular 21 Mark Street⁴ and other appeal decisions. I been provided with limited details to compare this to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
21. The appellant contends that there is a drive to rationalise, modernise and upgrade advertising infrastructure with the aim of reducing the number of displays. I have not been provided with evidence to confirm which advertisements would be removed in the area as part of this strategy. Notwithstanding this, advertisements in the wider area predominantly comprise of shop front advertisements as such the industry strategy would not deliver a positive improvement on amenity in this case.
22. The reduction in waste from poster production and vehicle trips to repost advertisements at the site is purported as a benefit by the appellant. However, I have not been provided with any evidence to confirm what the environmental benefit would be in comparison to the production, installation, maintenance and supplying of an energy source to the proposed development.
23. The appellant claims that void periods could be used for non-commercial purposes such as charitable campaigns and public art, or act as a societal benefit by supporting emergency messaging. Whilst this maybe the case the proposed advertisement is for commercial use where advertisement space is sold, no evidence to support a social benefit has been provided.
24. Economic benefits have been asserted by appellant that where displays are upgraded these typically result in an uplift in rent which would in turn increase business rates payable to the Council. The appellant also claims, amongst other things that the upgrade would allow greater flexibility to enable better access to advertising displays for local businesses.
25. Notwithstanding the appellants claims relating to environmental, social and economic improvements that the proposed advertisement would create, similar to

⁴ Ref: N/105/01352/22

the previous appeal decision, the Regulations⁵, the Framework⁶ and Planning Practice Guidance⁷ are clear that the appeal shall be considered with regard to amenity and public safety. Even if these improvements were demonstrated they would not outweigh the harm I have found in relation to amenity.

Conclusion

26. The appeal is dismissed and express consent is refused for the upgrade of existing 48 sheet advert to support digital poster as applied for.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

⁵ Regulation 3(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

⁶ Paragraph 141

⁷ Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 18b-026-20140306