

## **Development Control Committee 4 November 2020**

### **Application for Advertisement Consent DC/20/0817/ADV – Land adjacent to Tesco Petrol Station, Willie Snaitth Road, Newmarket**

<b>Date registered:</b>	1 June 2020	<b>Expiry date:</b>	06 November 2020
<b>Case officer:</b>	Adam Ford	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Approve application
<b>Parish:</b>	Newmarket Town Council	<b>Ward:</b>	Newmarket North
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for Advertisement Consent - 1 no. internally illuminated freestanding totem sign		
<b>Site:</b>	Land Adjacent To Tesco Petrol Station, Willie Snaitth Road, Newmarket		
<b>Applicant:</b>	McDonald's Restaurants Ltd		

**Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Development Control Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CASE OFFICER:

Adam Ford

Email: adam.ford@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 07984 468062

## **Background:**

1. This application was presented to the West Suffolk Development Control Committee on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2020. Members resolved to defer the item to allow an opportunity for the applicant to address the objections of Newmarket Town Council.
2. Accordingly, on the 15<sup>th</sup> September a virtual meeting between the Town Council and the applicant took place via Zoom. During this meeting, the Town Council reiterated their belief that the proposal failed to meet policy NKT32 of the Newmarket Neighbourhood plan. The applicant advised that their ability to entirely redesign the advertisement is limited although the comments from the Town Council would be considered.
3. Following the virtual meeting, amended plans have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority which seek advertisement consent for a re-designed proposal. The amended plans which are visible online are as follows:
  - Amended elevations: 6929\_SA\_8361\_SK20E
  - Amended site layout: 6929\_SA\_8361\_P022N

## **Proposal:**

4. Following the submission of the amended plans referred to above, the application seeks advertisement consent for a 5m tall totem pole with McDonald's and Costa branding. The totem pole will be internally illuminated with a maximum luminance of 300 candela per metre squared.
5. The proposed advertisement is 1.44m wide and 0.32m deep; the former proposal was 2.8m wide and 0.48m deep. The current proposal, whilst remaining at 5m tall has been reduced in width by 1.4m and has reduced in depth by 0.16m.
6. Visually, the totem pole will comprise four main panels as set out below.
  - Top advertising panel: green background with yellow illuminated 'M' for McDonald's measuring 1.44m x 1.48m
  - Middle advertising panel: red background with white illuminated 'Costa' text measuring 1.44m x 1.14m
  - Bottom advertising panel: green background with white and yellow illuminated McDonald's 'Drive Thru' branding measuring 1.44m x 0.64m
  - Base timber panel with no advert: 1.44m x 1.34m

## **Site details:**

7. The site is located on the corner of Willie Snaith Road and Fordham Road, north of the town centre. The site is presently empty and has been for several years. Surrounding uses comprise Tesco superstore and Wickes

with other office and employment uses in the close vicinity. Planning permission under DC/18/2210/FUL has recently been granted for 2no drive-through cafe/restaurant units (DC/18/2210/FUL).

**Planning history:**

8.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Decision date</b>
DC/18/2210/FUL	Planning Application - (i) 2no drive-through cafe/restaurant units (Use Class A1/A3 for Costa and Use Class A3/A5 for McDonald's) with associated parking and landscaping and (ii) McDonalds Climbing box	Application Granted	9 June 2020
DC/18/2211/ADV	Application for Advertisement Consent - (i) 3no internally illuminated fascia signs, (ii) 1no internally illuminated height barrier, (iii) 2no internally illuminated key seller boards, (iv) 1no double menu board, (v) 1no banner, (vi) 1no totem (vii) parking signs and (viii) 2no directional signs	Application Withdrawn	15 April 2020
DC/19/0021/ADV	Application for Advertisement Consent - 7no. internally illuminated fascia signs	Application Granted	9 June 2020
DC/19/0031/ADV	Application for Advertisement Consent - Various site signage including - (i) 17 no. non illuminated Directional signs (ii) 5no. internally illuminated Digital screen signs (iii) 1no. internally illuminated Playland sign	Application Granted	22 February 2019
NMA(A)/18/2210	Non Material Amendment - to amend Condition 8 to read "at least 2 publicly available electric vehicle charge points ..."	Application Granted	18 June 2020

## **Consultations:**

### **SCC Highway Authority**

9. The Highway Authority initially responded to this application on the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2020 confirming they had no objection.

In response to the amended plans, the Highway Authority's updated comments dated 20<sup>th</sup> October confirm that they still have no objection to the proposal.

### **Public Health and Housing**

10. Public Health and Housing initially responded to this application on the 10<sup>th</sup> June 2020 confirming they had no objection.

In response to the amended plans, Public Health and Housing's updated comments dated 19<sup>th</sup> October confirm that they still have no objection to the proposal.

## **Representations:**

### **Newmarket Town Council**

11. The Town Council have submitted one set of formal comments on this application dated 29<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

Summary of comments made on 29<sup>th</sup> June – initial proposal:

The Town Council have submitted an objection to this proposal on the basis that they feel it does not comply with NKT32. The objection states that the Town Council feel the advertisement will be prominent and visible, dominating the landscape along the A142.

Following the submission of amended plans, a re-consultation was issued to the Town Council on the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020. This afforded the Town Council with 14 days to respond.

As of the 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020, the Town Council have not provided further comments.

### **Ward Member**

12. The comments below represent those submitted by Councillor Karen Soons in response to the original application. No comments have been submitted in response to the amended plans.

I am opposed to the application of a 5 metre (16 and a half foot) luminous yellow 'M' in the sky over Newmarket. There is no planning precedent for such a sign any-where in Newmarket. This is why I feel it should be refused:

- It contravenes policy 32 of the Newmarket Neighbourhood plan
- It is out of step with existing signage in Newmarket (no 5m sign exists in the town even at the nearby Burger King).

- It goes against government advice on obesity. Fast food advertising should not appear on television before 9pm so why is it ok to erect a 5m advertising sign adjacent to the George Lampton (Children's) Playing fields?
- We as a nation are in the midst of a global Pandemic, (Covid 19) that has fatal consequences for those classified as obese.
- We are, as of now also in the midst of a nationally recognised obesity epidemic. The combination of D & E could prove fatal for the future of our children and residents in Newmarket.

Please refuse this application as being against government advice on fast food advertising, planning precedent, Newmarket Neighbourhood plan and at variance to health advice in an obesity epidemic and health pandemic made worse by obesity.

### **Public comments**

13. Neighbour notification letters were issued to 3, 4 and 5 Hatchfield Cottages on the 6<sup>th</sup> June 2020 and again on the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 following the submission of amended plans.

14. However, no public comments were received in response at the time of writing this report.

### **Policy:**

15. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by regulation. The development plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved Forest Heath District Council.

The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the Forest Heath Core Strategy 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

#### **Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan**

- NKT32 – Gateways into the Town

#### **Forest Heath Core Strategy Document**

- Core Strategy Policy CS5 - Design quality and local distinctiveness

#### **Joint Development Management Policies Document**

- Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness

- Policy DM38 Shop Fronts and Advertisements

## **Other Planning Policy / legislation**

### **16.The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007**

- 17.It should be noted that this is not an application for planning permission. It is an application for advertisement consent only.
- 18.Regulation 3 of the 2007 Advertisement Regulations requires that local planning authorities control the display of advertisements in the interests of **amenity** and **public safety**, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, in so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.
- 19.Unless the nature of the advertisement is in itself harmful to amenity or public safety, consent cannot be refused because the local planning authority considers the advertisement to be misleading (in so far as it makes misleading claims for products), unnecessary or offensive to public morals.

## **National Planning Policy Framework (2019)**

- 20.The NPPF was revised in February 2019 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF.
- 21.Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2019 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

## **Officer comment:**

- 22.The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:
- Regulation 3 of the 2007 Advertisement Regulations
  - Impact on amenity: scale and form
  - Impact on amenity: illumination
  - Impact on public safety

## **Regulation 3 of the 2007 Advertisement Regulations**

- 23.The display of advertisements is subject to a separate consent process within the planning system. This is principally set out in the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

24. As clarified above, regulation 3 of the advertisement regulations state that in determining applications for advertisement consent, local planning authorities may only consider **amenity** and **public safety**, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, in so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. Other matters such as misleading claims or potential offence to public morals are not relevant in the determination of such applications.

### **Impact on amenity: scale and form**

25. "Amenity" is not defined exhaustively in the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007. It does, however, include aural and visual amenity (regulation 2(1)) and factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest (regulation 3(2)(a)).

26. In practice, "amenity" is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement or site for the display of advertisements, where residents or passers-by will be aware of the advertisement. It is, however, a matter of judgement by the local planning authority as it applies in any particular case.

27. Therefore, in assessing amenity, the local planning authority would always consider the local characteristics of the neighbourhood: for example, if the locality where the advertisement is to be displayed has important scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features, the local planning authority would consider whether it is in scale and in keeping with these features. In this instance, the advertisement is proposed in an area which is dominated by commercial and functionally styled / scaled buildings with associated advertisements common.

28. With respect to the development plan, Policy DM38 (Shop Front and Advertisements) states that proposals for advertisement must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the building or location of which it forms a part, and the street scene in which the proposal is located, and must not adversely affect amenity and/or public safety. In addition, Policy DM2 also seeks to ensure advertisements are not unduly large or visually jarring and it also requires that such proposals do not undermine the prevailing or existing amenity.

29. Policy NKT32 of the Newmarket Neighbourhood plan is also relevant in that the site is identified as being a gateway into the town. Specifically, NKT32 states that *"any new development or re-development at the gateways to the town (as identified on Policies Map 1) and in particular along the A142, should be of high quality and sympathetic to the locality."*

30. In this instance, the proposed advertisement, as amended, is relatively modest in scale with a height of 5m and a width of 1.4m. This will be read and interpreted within the context of the wider, commercially styled locality, including the recently consented restaurants and drive thru facilities, and, as a result, the free-standing advertisement is not considered to represent a departure away from the area's existing vernacular or character. The advertisement would be positioned in-front of the approved drive-thru units and it will not therefore be seen in isolation

or presented in a way which is considered to be harmful to the street scene or character of the area. Given the existing advertisements and developments already in situ (Tesco totem poles: 5.7m and 7.1m and Wickes totem pole: 6m for example), the modestly scaled totem pole is not considered to be an addition which would be visually jarring or out of character. As such, the advertisement is not considered to represent a proposal that the Local Planning Authority could justify recommending for refusal.

31. The detailed objection (dated 29<sup>th</sup> June 2020) from the Town Council is noted but in considering the application, it must be understood that the advertisement cannot be assessed against policy NKT32 in isolation. The proposal is considered against the advice within the NPPF and the development plan as a whole (insofar as it is relevant to advertisements). The advertisement is considered to comply with policies DM2 and DM38 with respect to its scale and siting.
32. As noted, policy NKT32 specifically states "*any new development or re-development at the gateways to the town (as identified on Policies Map 1) and in particular along the A142, should be of high quality and sympathetic to the locality*". Accordingly, given the locality within which the advertisement is proposed and the prevailing commercial, functional form, although the objection from the Town Council is noted, officers do not concur that the proposal conflicts with NKT32. By virtue of its relatively modest scale and non-intrusive colour scheme, the proposed advertisement is considered to be suitably and aesthetically sympathetic to the locality.
33. It should be noted that the proposed advertisement represents a *significantly* smaller version than the applicant had initially planned for the site. Officers gave pre-application advice to the applicant and this has resulted in a potential 12m totem pole being reduced to what is presently proposed; being 5m in height. Members are also reminded that the applicant has reduced the width of the advertisement from 2.8m to 1.4m in a further attempt to satisfy the initial objection from the Town Council. This represents a 50% reduction in overall width and should be considered as a significant and material alteration given the concerns raised by the Town Council.
34. This is a substantial reduction compared to what was initially proposed at pre-application stage and what was then considered by Members at the September Development Control Committee. That said, the application should be considered on its merits in terms of the details now proposed. For the reasons set out above, to require a further reduction, given the requirements of DM2, DM38 and NKT3, would in the opinion of officers be unreasonable and not something that would withstand scrutiny at appeal should the advertisement to be refused on the grounds of scale or appearance.

### **Impact on amenity: illumination**

35. In addition to the scale and form of the advertisement, in considering the amenity impacts, the Local Planning Authority must also have regard to the degree of illuminance. The development to which the advertisement

relates (presently a Costa and a McDonalds) is permitted to trade on a 24hour basis. The proposed advertisement is therefore intended to be illuminated during night-time hours of trade although the applicant has not stated specific hours. It is therefore appropriate for the LPA to consider the illumination and its impact pragmatically.

36. Within this section of the report, the extent of the illumination has been considered within the context of relevant legislation and lighting guidance.

37. The advertisement as proposed comprises three areas of illumination; the 'M' for the McDonalds and the white Costa text and the white/yellow drive thru car. The drawings indicate that the illumination will be static (i.e. no flashing or strobing) and that the maximum luminance shall be 300 candela per square metre.

38. To understand how 'bright' 300 candela is, reference should be made to two documents:

- The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007
- Guidance Notes for the reduction of obtrusive light GN01:2011 (as produced by the institute of lighting professionals)

39. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 set out when advertisements do and do not require consent. Although this advertisement requires consent, classes 2B, 2C, 4A, 4B and 5 allow a number of illuminated advertisements without requiring consent. This offers a useful reference point as the regulations state that where an advertisement does not require consent and it is to be illuminated, the following restrictions on illumination shall be relevant:

- where the illuminated area is not more than 10 square metres, 600 candela per square metre; and
- where the illuminated area is more than 10 square metres, 300 candela per square metre.

40. In this instance, the proposed advertisement does not exceed the level of illuminance which is considered acceptable in the national regulations for those advertisements which do not require consent – this nationally prescribed level being 600 candela per sqm. In this respect, the advertisement, which has an illuminance value of 300 candela per sqm, is not therefore considered to represent an unacceptably visually obtrusive design which would give rise to unacceptable amenity impacts.

41. In addition, the guidance notes for the reduction of obtrusive light GN01:2011 (as produced by the institute of lighting professionals) offer a useful point of reference in considering the degree of illumination as proposed. As noted, this is a technical document, but it offers a simple explanation for general consumption.

42. The guidance note is designed to illustrate what levels of lighting are appropriate in particular locations. To do this, table 1 splits land uses into 5 typologies depending on their characteristics:

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Surrounding</b>	<b>Lighting Environment</b>	<b>Examples</b>
E0	Protected	Dark	UNESCO Starlight Reserves, IDA Dark Sky Parks
E1	Natural	Intrinsically dark	National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty etc
E2	Rural	Low district brightness	Village or relatively dark outer suburban locations
E3	Suburban	Medium district brightness	Small town centres or suburban locations
E4	Urban	High district brightness	Town/city centres with high levels of night-time activity

43. In this instance, the application site would be considered as being within the E3 zone given the location with respect to the main settlement and the presence of the existing 'out of center' commercial units. It is not deemed to be within E2 as the area is well lit by lighting columns and is not in a rural location.

44. Having established that the site lies within what could reasonably be described as zone E3 (as confirmed through comments from the Highway Authority on other, adjacent applications), the guidance note then enables users to consider what lighting levels are appropriate by stating what would be considered as excessive in both pre curfew conditions (non-sensitive times; daylight, early evening) and post curfew conditions (sensitive time; 11pm onwards).

45. The important column within table 2 to look at is therefore the one highlighted blue; this shows what level of illuminance in candela would be considered intrusive in the E3 zone, during hours of darkness:

<b>Environmental Zone</b>	<b>Sky Glow ULR [Max %]<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>Light Intrusion (into Windows) E<sub>v</sub> [lux]<sup>(2)</sup></b>		<b>Luminaire Intensity I [candelas]<sup>(3)</sup></b>	
		<b>Pre-curfew</b>	<b>Post-curfew</b>	<b>Pre-curfew</b>	<b>Post-curfew</b>
E0	0	0	0	0	0
E1	0	2	0 ( 1*)	2,500	0
E2	2.5	5	1	7,500	500
<b>E3</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
E4	15	25	5	25,000	2,500

46. The table above illustrates that when located in zone E3, after the 'curfew' (when it is reasonable to expect less light and darker conditions), an illumination value of 1000 candela would be considered as visually obtrusive. However, the advertisement as proposed has a value of 300 candela. Therefore, given the extent to which this is *below* what the institute of lighting professionals prescribe as being visually obtrusive, a conflict with policy CS5, DM2, DM38 or NKT32 has not been identified by the Local Planning Authority.

47. Although the above illustrates that the proposed advertisement is not considered as excessively bright, how long the advertisement will be illuminated must also be considered. In doing this, it should be noted that under DC/19/0021/ADV, advertisement consent has already been granted for a number of fascia signs to be illuminated without restrictions on times; they are permitted to be 'on' 24 hours.
48. Accordingly, taking policies DM2 and DM38 into account insofar as they relate to residential amenity, the nearest dwelling is located approximately 53m to the South of the totem pole. It is noted that the area is already dominated by a proliferation of illuminated advertisements and street lighting. However, the proposal results in an illuminated advertisement being closer to a private residential dwelling and there is limited screening between the proposed dwelling and the site of the proposed totem pole. It is noted however that no public comments have been submitted in response to the application.
49. Therefore, given the degree of illuminance already permitted under DC/19/0021/ADV and noting the need to protect residential amenity, although the advertisement is not considered to be excessively bright, it will emit a visual glow, the impact of which must be considered.
50. The submitted application form does not clarify when the applicant wishes for the advertisement pole to be illuminated although it is understood, based on discussions with the agent that the intention is for it to be illuminated during all hours of darkness. Public Health & Housing have also not suggested any restriction on hours although this does not preclude the further consideration of the potential impact on amenity, taking into account any cumulative impacts as may arise.
51. As such, given the proximity of the dwelling to the south, the existing degree of illuminance and the need to curtail unrestricted proliferation of advertisements, when the original totem pole was proposed as being illuminated to 600 candela per sqm the Local Planning Authority considered it reasonable to condition the hours of illuminance as follows:
- Monday: 6am until midnight
  - Tuesday: 6am until midnight
  - Wednesday: 6am until midnight
  - Thursday: 6am until midnight
  - Friday: 6am until midnight
  - Saturday: 6am until midnight
  - Sundays / bank holidays: 6am until 10pm
52. However, this would have resulted in a position whereby the advertisement was not operational during the night and it is noted that a 24-hour convenience offering such as this will, to an extent, likely rely on a degree of 'after dark' trading. Instead of the above restriction, the applicant has volunteered that the illuminance will be reduced by 50% from 600 candelas per sqm to 300 candelas per sqm. This represents a significant reduction in illuminance and, on balance, given the context of the site, would enable support of the 24-hour illumination sought by the applicant. This positively negotiated outcome offers a compromised position in which the illuminance has been reduced by half without the need to impose further conditional control over the advertisement.

53. Following the significant reduction in the illuminance levels, and given the above discussion with respect to amenity, a specific condition which requires the advertisement to be switched off is not considered to be required. Accordingly, a conflict with policies CS5, DM2, DM38 or NKT32 has not been identified by officers.

### **Impact on public safety**

54. In assessing the impact of an advertisement on public safety, a Local Planning Authority is expected to have regard to the effect upon the safe use and operation of any form of traffic or transport on land including the safety of pedestrians. The proposed totem pole will be positioned on land owned by the applicant and will not therefore cause any obstruction to pedestrians or impede the adjacent footpath. Whilst the signs will be illuminated and visible from the adjacent roundabout, the Highway Authority is satisfied that they will not cause such a distraction to motorists to be considered dangerous and as such, the signage would not have any adverse effects in terms of public safety. The Highway Authority have not altered their position with respect to the application and raise no objections.

55. The advertisement is also positioned so that it is not immediately adjacent to the roundabout; it is set back away from the junction with Willie Snaith Road by approximately 26m. This serves to prevent motorists being potentially distracted whilst on the roundabout which is something that the Highway Authority would seek to avoid in the interest of highway safety.

56. Given the lack of an objection from the Highway Authority, the proposed advertisement is not judged to conflict with policies DM2(L), DM38 or paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Other matters**

57. Within the 'consultation' section of this report, comments as provided by the Ward Member, Cllr Soons have been reproduced. The concerns raised with respect to the scale and physical presence have been addressed above with direct reference to relevant planning policy and technical guidance.

58. However, the comments made with respect to obesity, Covid-19 and televised advertising are not relevant to the determination of an application for advertisement consent.

59. Regulation 3 of the 2007 Advertisement Regulations very clearly states that in determining applications for advertisement consent, Local Planning Authorities may only have regard to amenity and public safety. In this context, public safety includes all of the considerations which are relevant to the safe use and operation of any form of traffic or transport on land (including the safety of pedestrians), over water or in the air.

60.It does not, however, include issues such as a perceived increased propensity for obesity; it would therefore be unlawful to base a decision on matters which the legislation specifically excludes from being material.

## **Conclusion & planning balance**

61.In conclusion, the principle and detail of the proposed advertisement is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

62.As set out within this report, when determining applications for advertisement consent, local planning authorities may, given the provisions of the 2007 Advertisement Regulations, only consider amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, in so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.

63.In this instance, the relevant policies against which the proposal should be considered are CS5, DM2, DM38 and NKT32. Whilst the initial objection from the Town Council and elected ward member are respectfully noted, no further objection has been submitted in response to the amended plans and the advertisement as proposed is not judged to conflict with the aforementioned policies insofar as they relate to amenity and public safety.

64.Accordingly, no material reasons have been identified which would otherwise outweigh the relevant policy support, and subject to the conditions below, the illuminated totem pole is considered to represent a policy compliant proposal.

## **Recommendation:**

65.It is recommended that advertisement consent be **GRANTED** subject to the standard advertisement conditions as set out in appendix 1 and the following bespoke conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans and documents:

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Plan type</b>	<b>Date received</b>
6929-SA-8361-AL01A	Location plan	21 May 2020
6929 SA 8361 P022 N	Layout	01 October 2020
6929_SA_8361_SK2 0E	Sign details	01 October 2020

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.

- 2 The maximum luminance from the freestanding 5m totem sign shall not exceed 300 candela/m<sup>2</sup> unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in order to avoid disability or discomfort glare for either pedestrians or motorists.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online <DC/20/0817/ADV>

Case officer:

Adam Ford

Phone:

07984 468062