



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P0204/Z/25/3371267**

**Brittany Court, High Street South, Dunstable, Central Bedfordshire, LU6 3HR.**

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
  - The appeal is made by Alight Media, against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
  - The application Ref is CB/25/01765/ADV.
  - The proposal is the erection of one internally illuminated, 48-sheet, 6m by 3m, LED digital advertisement display.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the erection of one internally illuminated, 48-sheet, 6m by 3m, LED digital advertisement display at Brittany Court, High Street South, Dunstable, Central Bedfordshire, LU6 3HR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/25/01765/ADV and Drawings T4896 A4 50, 51, 60 and 61. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional condition:

The advertisement display subject to this consent shall have a maximum luminance of 300 candelas per square metre.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement display on public safety and amenity, taking account of any cumulative impacts.

### Reasons

#### *Public Safety*

3. The proposed illuminated advertisement panel would be mounted on the south east gable of Brittany Court, facing into an adjacent garage forecourt and towards traffic moving north westwards along High Street. The garage is one of a range of commercial properties fronting this highly urban section of High Street South. Many of the nearby businesses prominently display their own advertisement panels, many of them illuminated.
4. The proposed display would differ from most others in the vicinity to the extent that it would be larger and in a more elevated position and would show changing illuminated images not necessarily directly related to the immediate locality. I recognise the concern of the highway authority that, as a result, there is degree of

- potential for the new display to distract passing drivers, on this busy street close to a pedestrian crossing and several junctions and entrances.
5. At the same time, displays of the type and size as that proposed in this case are no longer an unusual feature of the urban environment of Central Bedfordshire and beyond. The display would not show any moving images and its level of illuminance could be limited by planning condition, as suggested without prejudice by the Council.
  6. In these circumstances, drivers using High Street South can be expected to be broadly accustomed to potential distraction and to be more likely to focus on responding to road traffic hazards, including crossing points and junctions, than on the advertising images displayed as proposed.
  7. I consider, on balance, that the potential degree of driver distraction due to the proposed advertisement display would not be so significant as to warrant substantive objection to this appeal on grounds of public safety.
  8. In this respect, I regard the proposal as aligned with the material provisions of Policy T2 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (CBLP) with respect to highway safety.

#### *Amenity*

9. For similar reasons to those explained above regarding public safety, I do not consider that the proposed advertisement display would be unduly out of keeping with or visually harmful to High Street South.
10. Notably, Brittany Court is outside but closely adjacent to the boundary of the Dunstable Conservation Area (CA) which, at this point, runs along the south west side of High Street, including the frontage of the adjacent garage forecourt. The CA encompasses a number of Listed Buildings fronting High Street. Clearly the proposed advertisement display would be within the setting of the CA.
11. However, the display would not face directly towards the CA boundary and visually would be part of the commercial street frontage, separated from the buildings of the CA by the busy carriageway of High Street. None of the Listed Buildings within the CA would be in close proximity to the advertisement.
12. Accordingly, I do not consider that, either individually or cumulatively with other features, the advertisement display proposed in this case would have any significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of High Street South or on the setting or views of the Dunstable CA or of any of the Listed Buildings within it.
13. With respect to amenity therefore, I find that the proposed advertising panel would align also with the material requirements of the Policies HQ1 and HE3 of the CBLP concerning the quality of design and the preservation of designated heritage assets.

*Conclusion*

14. For the reasons explained in relation to amenity and public safety, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed and the consent sought granted, subject to the standard conditions of the 2007 Regulations and a single further condition to limit the luminance of the display.

*B J Sims*

INSPECTOR