



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/Z/25/3371487

North of Station Road, Stapleford, Nottingham, NG10 5AP

- 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 Limited against the decision of Borslow Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00421/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of a freestanding D-Poster LED advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) reiterate this approach. Therefore, while I have referred to a policy that the Council considers to be relevant to this appeal, this has not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is, therefore, the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity. The advertisement regulations state that factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality. The Framework says that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and that cumulative impacts should be taken into account. The development plan includes policy 18 of the Council's Part 2 Local Plan 2018-2028 (adopted 2019) which says that signage should respect the character of the area.
4. The proposal would consist of a freestanding digital poster display of some 6m by 3m, 5.2m above ground level at its highest point, displaying multiple advertisements at a time, sequencing every ten seconds. It would be sited close to a busy B-road on a small piece of land between the River Erewash and a vehicle recycling centre, within an immediate area of mainly industrial and commercial uses, although I noted at my visit that a nearby terrace of small shops has living accommodation above. The end unit in that terrace has first floor windows in its side elevation that face the appeal site despite the presence of some tree screening along the river, although I note that the Council has not objected in terms of the effect on residential amenity, only visual amenity.

5. The proposed digital sign would be sited adjacent and at broadly 90° to the road and bridge and adjacent to the access to the vehicle recycling centre which has an existing sign that the appellant has confirmed would be removed under this proposal. On the opposite side of that access is a similarly-sized 48 sheet advertisement hoarding and three separate place name and commercial signs. There are also several place name and commercial signs on either side of another access on the opposite side of the road. All of those are non-illuminated signs but with the exception of the sign that would be removed, would be viewed within the same context when travelling eastwards along Station Road, in addition to the smaller scale signage above the terrace of shops. Other 48 sheet hoardings on the opposite side of the road on the flank wall of 71 Station Road and at Bessell Lane would not be viewed within the same context. Whilst most are mounted on buildings or poles, I disagree with the appellant that they do not dominate the streetscape and found at my visit that the signage appears cluttered and lacking in cohesion. The removal of one of those signs, which is considerably smaller in size than that proposed, would not outweigh the harm that would be caused by an additional sign of this size even with a condition to control brightness.
6. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would ensure a number of benefits, including a reduction in vehicle trips for reposting paper adverts, eradicating the need to print posters and avoiding the associated waste involved in the production process, the ability to broadcast emergency messaging, the ability to use void periods for non-commercial campaigns, the opportunity for more creative real time and locally relevant advertising and the opportunity to integrate additional hardware to meet the Smart City objective. Whilst that might be the case, some of those are minor matters and there is little substantive evidence of the benefits that would arise. In any case, those matters do not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused by this proposal.

Conclusion

7. I conclude that the proposal would result in significant harm to amenity and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector