



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2026

by **A Hickey MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 04 March 2026**

---

### **Appeal Ref: 6001733**

#### **Pavement o/s 153 Huntingdon Street, Nottingham NG1 3NL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/01487/PFUL3.
  - The development proposed is new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display and defibrillator.
- 

### **Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/Z/25/3375877**

#### **Pavement o/s 153 Huntingdon Street, Nottingham NG1 3NL**

- 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 Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/01488/ADV2.
  - The advertisement proposed is 1no. digital advertisement display within proposed new communications kiosk.
- 

## **Decisions**

### **Appeal A**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display and defibrillator at Pavement o/s 153 Huntingdon Street, Nottingham NG1 3NL in accordance with the terms of the application ref 25/01487/PFUL3 subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### **Appeal B**

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1no. digital advertisement display within proposed new communications kiosk at Pavement o/s 153 Huntingdon Street, Nottingham NG1 3NL as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the additional conditions set out in the attached schedule.

## **Preliminary Matters**

3. There are two appeals relating to the site, one against the refusal of planning permission and the other against the refusal of advertisement consent. They are intrinsically linked and raise similar issues. While considering each on its own merits, I have dealt with both in a single decision letter.

4. I am also the Inspector appointed to determine other appeals<sup>1</sup> against Nottingham City Council for the same appellant and development types. Although I have also determined each appeal on its own merits, the similarity in the reasons for refusal and evidence presented results in some duplication in how I have addressed common matters.
5. In relation to Appeal B, the Regulations<sup>2</sup> 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 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirm this approach. Therefore, while I have taken account of the policies that the Council considers to be relevant, these have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.

## **Main Issues**

6. The main issue in respect of Appeal A is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The main issue in respect of Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance/visual amenity*

8. The appeal site is located on the pavement in front of a multi-storey building accommodating a range of uses. The building is substantial in scale and sits adjacent to the footway, with a four-lane road opposite. The surrounding area has a mixed character, with a variety of recreational and commercial uses at ground-floor level along this section of Huntingdon Street. Within the street scene and wider area there is a range of street furniture of differing heights and widths, including a tall, partially digital parking sign, vehicle bollards, telecommunications cabinets, litter bins, clothing donation bins, lighting columns and road signage.
9. The proposed kiosk would add additional street furniture to the area in which there is already a variety of such features. However, the kiosk would not appear out of place within this mixed recreational and commercial streetscape, where existing modern street furniture and various forms of advertising are already prominent features. Moreover, given the height and scale of the adjacent building and nearby street furniture including the parking sign, the kiosk and its associated advertisements would not result in harmful visual clutter or detract from the visual amenity of the area.
10. For the reasons given above, the development and the advertising display would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the visual amenity of the area. It would therefore not conflict with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Broxtowe Borough Gedling Borough Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan and Policies DE1, DE2 and DE5 of the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document Local Plan Part 2, which collectively aim to secure well-designed, context-responsive developments.

## **Other Matters**

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal refs: **6001668** and **APP/Q3060/Z/25/3375758**

<sup>2</sup> The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

11. The Council has not raised any issues of public safety. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree.

**Conditions**

12. I have considered the imposition of conditions against the advice in the Framework and PPG. In addition to the time limit condition, a plans condition is also necessary for Appeal A.
13. Appeal B would be subject to the 5 standard conditions, as set out in the Regulations. In addition, to prevent the proposed advertisement from distracting road users and in the interest of visual amenity, conditions on illumination and display are necessary.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons set out above, Appeals A and B are allowed.

*A Hickey*

INSPECTOR

## **Schedule of Conditions**

### **Appeal A**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings: NWP-KIOSK/001, 4870-001-006, and the Location Plan.

*End*

### **Appeal B**

- 1) In the hours of darkness, the advertisement display luminance shall be no greater than 300cd/m<sup>2</sup> in accordance with the recommended maximum night time luminance value set out in Table 10.4 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m<sup>2</sup>.
- 2) In daylight hours, the advertisement display luminance shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions (to ensure it is neither too bright or too dull), and shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in Table 10.5 within the Institute of Lighting Professionals - Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m<sup>2</sup>.
- 3) No individual advertisement on the LED screen shall contain moving images, animation, intermittent or full motion video images, or any images that resemble road signs or traffic signals. The installation shall include a mechanism that freezes the display or shuts the screen down in the event of a malfunction.

*End*