

Report of the Interim Chief Executive

Appeal Decision

APPLICATION NUMBER:	25/00421/ADV
LOCATION:	Advertising On Railway Bridge Derby Road Stapleford Nottinghamshire
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a freestanding D-Poster LED advertisement.

APPEAL DISMISSED**DELEGATED DECISION TO REFUSE****RECOMMENDATION BY OFFICER – REFUSE****REASON FOR REFUSAL –**

The proposed advertising hoarding, by virtue of its cumulative impact resulting in an unacceptable proliferation of signage in the immediate area, would cause visual harm to the locality and amenity along Derby Road thereby posing an unacceptable addition to the street scene. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policy 18 of the Part 2 Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and there is no justification for treating the advertisement as an exception to that guidance.

LEVEL OF DECISION: Commercial Appeals Service

The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors.

The inspector considered the main issue to consider was:

- the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity. 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 Inspector noted that the digital display 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 use, but it was also noted that there is a nearby terrace of shops with living accommodation above. The end flat having a first floor window in its side elevation facing the appeal site with some trees screening along the river.

The Inspector noted that there is numerous signage within the area, and that whilst most are mounted on buildings or poles, they disagreed with the appellants view that they do not dominate the streetscape and found on their visit that the signage appears cluttered and lacking in cohesion. Also noting that whilst one sign would be removed, it is considerably smaller in size than that proposed, and would not outweigh the harm that would be caused by an additional sign of this size even with a condition to control brightness.

In terms of the appellants suggested benefits such as a reduction in vehicle trips, reducing waste, and the ability to display emergency massaging and non-commercial campaigns, the Inspector stated 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.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would result in significant harm to amenity and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that.

Conclusion

For the reasons given above the appeal was dismissed.