



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by **C Evans MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6002395

Pavement o/s Nottingham City Delivery Office, 1 Lower Parliament Street, Nottingham NG1 1AA

- 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 Mr Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01489/PFUL3.
 - The development proposed is new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display and defibrillator.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Q3060/Z/25/3376388

Pavement o/s Nottingham City Delivery Office, 1 Lower Parliament Street, Nottingham NG1 1AA

- 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 Mr Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01490/ADV2.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as “new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display and defibrillator”.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display and defibrillator at pavement outside Nottingham City Delivery Office, 1 Lower Parliament Street, Nottingham NG1 1AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01489/PFUL3, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 4870-001-007 Site Plan, NWP-KIOSK/001 Elevations.
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1 no. digital advertisement display within proposed new communications kiosk at pavement outside Nottingham City Delivery Office, 1 Lower Parliament Street, Nottingham NG1 1AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01490/ADV2, dated 6 August 2025. 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 conditions:

- 1) At all times, the display shall operate within the recommendations by the Institution of Lighting Professionals in its Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (or its equivalent in a replacement guide).
- 2) The advertisement permitted by this consent shall display static images only and the rate of content change shall be limited to no more than once every 10 seconds.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description in the banner heading above for Appeal B is taken from the application form. However, I've dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought for a new communications kiosk and advertisement consent for the integrated digital display. The description in my decision reflects that.
4. In respect of Appeal B, the Regulations require decisions regarding advertisements to be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, whilst taking any material considerations into account. The Council has referred to policies from the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014) (Core Strategy) and the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document, Local Plan Part 2 (January 2020) (Development Plan Document). I have taken these into account, but they have not been decisive in my determination of Appeal B.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for Appeal A is the effect of the proposed communications kiosk on the character and appearance of the area. The main issue for Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area. Since the main issues are similar, I have dealt with them together to avoid duplication.

Reasons

6. The appeals relate to a relatively wide section of pavement outside the Royal Mail Delivery Office on Lower Parliament Street. It is a mixed-use area, with commercial, employment and residential properties, including student accommodation.
7. The proposed kiosk and integrated advertisement would be located opposite the junction of Lennox Street. The backdrop would be the dominant built form of the Delivery Office building, which has a blank frontage along this elevation. In comparison, the proposed kiosk would be a small structure of a modern design. Consequently, it would not appear incongruous in the street scene.
8. The proposal would be sited between an existing road sign and streetlight, aligning with these. The remainder of the pavement is mostly free of other street furniture and consequently relatively uncluttered. There are Royal Mail post boxes and collection lockers present, but these are located within what appears to be the curtilage of the Delivery Office. No other similar structures are visible along this stretch of Lower Parliament Street. As a result, the proposal would not add or create visual clutter and would not result in a cramped appearance.

9. The Council contends that this stretch of pavement is often busy with pedestrians. I observed regular flows of movement during my site visit at lunchtime on a weekday. However, the pavement is wide and was not so busy to the extent that the proposed kiosk would cause obstruction to pedestrian flows, including those with wheelchairs or prams.
10. There are no advertisements within the immediate area of the proposed kiosk. However, this is an edge of city location, with commercial premises nearby. The proposed advertisement is relatively small in size as it will be integrated into the hub. The area is well lit, and so illumination from the proposed advertisement is unlikely to appear incongruous. Consequently, the proposal would not be an uncharacteristic addition to the street scene and would not be visually harmful in this respect.
11. For Appeal A, for the reasons highlighted above, I conclude that the proposed communications kiosk would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not conflict with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy or policies DE1 and DE2 of the Development Plan Document, which collectively, amongst other things, require development to respect the character of the area.
12. For Appeal B, I have taken into account Policy DE5 of the Development Plan Document, which seeks to protect amenity and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with this policy.

Conditions

13. For Appeal A, I have imposed a condition for the standard time limit for legislative reasons. For certainty, I have included a condition specifying the approved plans. The Council has not suggested any further conditions.
14. For Appeal B, the Council has not suggested any conditions other than the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations. However, in the interests of amenity, I consider a condition to restrict the intensity of illumination is required. Due to the site's location alongside a busy road, a second condition ensuring that the digital displays show static images only, with changes every ten seconds is required in the interests of public safety.
15. The appellant has made reference to the planting of a street tree, to be secured by condition. I have not been provided with a development plan policy to demonstrate that it is necessary. Consequently, I have not imposed this condition.

Conclusion

16. The development in Appeal A would accord with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations that indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, Appeal A is allowed
17. For the reasons given above, Appeal B is also allowed.

C Evans

INSPECTOR