



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2025 by S Indermaur BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 AUGUST 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/Z/25/3362163

Highway land just before entrance to Communications House, South Street, Staines TW18 4QE

- 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 Sandash Punj – Trueform Engineering Limited against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01506/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is display of double-sided free standing illuminated totem advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description provided in the application form is detailed and expansive. While I have taken that information into account, the wording used in the banner heading is based on the description in the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal documents as it more succinctly describes the proposed advertisement.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site relates to a footpath, in close proximity to a junction and a vehicle entrance to Communications House, a large office block. There is a range of street furniture at this location including a bin, railings associated with a pedestrian crossing and central reservation, bollards, traffic lights, lighting columns and various road signs. However, there is a notably limited presence of advertisements in the immediate area, particularly at street level. The area features large grass verges, mature trees and hedgerows which collectively contribute to an overriding spaciousness and verdancy to the roadside.
6. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that in practice, 'amenity' is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate

neighbourhood of an advertisement or site for the display of advertisements, where residents or passers-by will be aware of the advertisement.

7. Due to its imposing, monolithic form and isolated positioning on the footway, the totem advertisement would be an unsympathetic and visually intrusive feature which would poorly relate to the spacious character of the immediate surroundings. Even though the immediate area is not subject to historic or environmental designations, the advertisement's digital aesthetic and overtly commercial appearance would appear especially incongruous in the context of the otherwise understated signage present at this location. Controls over image sequencing, luminance, and hours that advertisements would be displayed would not mitigate the totem advertisement's overall unacceptable effects on the visual amenity of the area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to an existing advertisement which is located away from the appeal site. However, that advertisement is positioned much closer to the high street, within an environment characterised by retail uses and associated signage. As such, that advertisement relates to a different context. In any case, it does not justify the site-specific harm I have identified.
9. The proposal would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area and would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited.

Other Matters

10. I understand that the advertisement is part of a wider scheme to 'support Council messaging' and that this 'includes vital emergency and crisis management communication for local residents' information, and to promote local small businesses advertising'. The appellant also contends that it is essential that the advertisement is in a prominent location given the nature of the messaging so that it can be seen by as many people as possible. However, there is no evidence before me that such objectives could not be achieved without the appeal proposal, for example through the wider envisaged scheme or through an advertisement located in a more contextually appropriate position with less harmful effects on the visual amenity of an area.
11. The absence of any identified harm to public safety is not a reason to allow the appeal given the visual amenity harm identified under the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell INSPECTOR