

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 116-117 Broad Street, Reading, RG1 2BE

Application No: 171178/ADV

Proposals: Display of an internally illuminated internally located sign at second floor level on Broad Street elevation (part retrospective)

Applicant: Primark Stores Ltd

Date received (valid from): 31/07/17

Target Decision date: 25/09/17

Case officer: Jonathan Markwell

1. Site Description and Surrounding Area

- i. The application site comprises a largely three-storey and basement building fronting onto the south side of Broad Street, opposite the pedestrianised junction with Cross Street (to the north). The building has a secondary frontage on Minster Street, where vehicular access to basement level servicing is provided. The building represents one of the largest (in terms of floorspace) retail units within the town centre and has recently been occupied by Primark (trading from 01/11/16). Works associated with the use by Primark were approved in 2015 (see relevant history below), with the site having previously been occupied by BHS (who vacated the site early in 2015). It is understood that the building was previously redeveloped in the late 1960s, into the general form and appearance which was seen until the 2015 permission was implemented.
- ii. The site is located within a designated Active Frontage (Broad Street elevation only), the Primary Shopping Area, the Office Core and the Central Core. It is also within an area of Archaeological Importance and Air Quality Management Area. The site is outside of a designated conservation area, but is in close proximity to two. First, St Mary's Butts / Castle Street Conservation Area extends as far as Minster Court, which is to the south-west of the application site. Secondly, Market Place / London Street Conservation Area is within 50m of the Broad Street frontage. As such, the application site is located within the setting (views) of both conservation areas. Furthermore, the site is also located in close proximity to a number of listed buildings located outside of these conservation areas. First, opposite the site to the south is the Grade II listed Telephone Exchange building (41 - 45 Minster Street). This is 3 storeys in red brick with stone dressings in a Georgian style. Meanwhile to the north, there is a Grade II group listing for 1-31 & 2-32 Queen Victoria Street, 148,149 & 150 Friar Street, 24-28 & 35-38 Broad Street. No. 24 Broad Street is opposite the application site to the north and is an early 20th century red brick bank with large shaped pediment doorway on corner to Cross Street (occupied by Lloyds Bank).
- iii. The character of the surrounding area is largely retail in nature, with a variety of retail and other town centre uses on both Broad Street and Minster Street.

2. The Proposal

- i. Advertisement Consent is sought for the display of an internally illuminated internally located sign at second floor level on Broad Street elevation (part retrospective). The sign itself, which reads 'PRIMARK', is in place and in itself is considered lawful, with a certificate of lawfulness having been issued to confirm this (see relevant history below). However, this sign is non-illuminated and the proposal is for an internally illuminated internally located sign. Given the illuminated nature of the sign, the sign falls outside of the realms of Schedule 1, Class I of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as

amended), for which parts 2 (Deemed consent) and 3 (Express Consent) do not apply. Accordingly, advertisement consent has been sought on this basis.

- ii. The proposed internally illuminated sign would have a illuminance level of 600cd/m² (as per the application form), with the supporting document submitted by the applicant indicating 1250mm halo illuminated Primark letters fixed to the rear bulkhead.

3. Consultations

- i. Neighbour Consultation
There is no statutory requirement for publicity in relation to advertisement consent applications. Nevertheless, the applicant submitted documentation indicating a site notice had been erected on 8th August 2017. No responses have been received.
- ii. Internal consultation - Transport: No objection subject to condition regarding luminance levels as follows:

The maximum luminance from the Horizontal 'PRIMARK' fascia sign should not exceed 600 cd/m².

Reason: To avoid glare, which could lead to danger to highway users and in the interests of amenity in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS20 and Sites and Detailed Policies document Policy DM12.

4. Plans Considered

- i. The Council, in reaching its recommendation, has taken into consideration the following documents and information:

209 Rev 1.0 - Location and Site/Block Plan, as received 14/07/17

200 Rev 1.3 - Broad Street Signage Proposal, as received 14/07/17

Primark Reading Broad Street Signage Proposal V1, dated 12/07/17, as received 14/07/17

Email from Chart Plan 'RE: BROAD STREET ...SIGNAGE (171178)' dated and received 31/07/17

5. Most Relevant Planning History

- i. 110119/ADV (11/00265/ADV) - 2 x ground floor fascia signs; 2 x signs on Broad Street monolith; 3 x projecting signs; white lettering on basement level vinyl; 4 x red canvas signs at first floor level. Split decision - Advertisement consent part granted / part refused 12/07/2011. The four internally illuminated flexi-face canvas signs at first floor level (two on Broad Street, two on Minster Street) were not approved for the following reason:

The proposed signs by virtue their upper floor position, colour and luminance, would propagate and increase the visual clutter of signs along Broad Street and Minster Street. The signs would be harmful to the character and visual amenities of the town centre and are contrary to Saved Policies CUD14 and CUD15 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan, Policy CS7 of the LDF Core Strategy, and Policy RC5 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan.

- ii. 151221/FUL - Erection of second floor extension, roof level plant, various alterations to Broad Street and Minster Street facades and associated works. Granted following completion of s106 legal agreement 13/11/15.

- iii. 151241/ADV - Display of 4 fascia signs & 2 projecting signs to Broad Street elevation and 4 fascia signs & 1 projecting sign to Minster Street elevation (all internally illuminated) (amended description). Granted 16/11/15.
- iv. 152047/APPCON - Discharge of condition 5 (Construction Method Statement) of planning permission 151221. Discharged 15/01/16.
- v. 152057/APPCON - Discharge of condition 3 (materials) of planning permission 151221. Discharged 11/01/16.
- vi. 160031/VARIAT - Variation of conditions 6 (Construction Hours) and 7 (Noise assessment) of planning permission 151221 to widen the hours to carry out works and to allow the noise assessment to be approved prior to the first use of the second floor extension rather than prior to any development. Granted 24/05/16.
- vii. 160100/ADV - Display of 5 internally illuminated fascia signs to Broad Street elevation. Withdrawn 07/03/16.
- viii. 160143/NMA - Non-material amendments to planning permission 151221 for: Amalgamation of retail unit at 118 Broad Street into the demise of the proposed ground floor; alterations to Broad Street shopfront, including provision of 2 fire escape doors and alteration in position of main entrance; provision of eight windows at proposed second floor level on Minster Street elevation; and, enlarged roof plant area, provision of additional plant screen and provision of lift overrun at third floor level. Withdrawn 02/03/16.
- ix. 160464/VARIAT - Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 151221 (for the erection of second floor extension, roof level plant, various alterations to Broad Street and Minster Street facades and associated works), namely for minor material amendments to enable the amalgamation of a retail unit at 118 Broad Street into the demise of the proposed ground floor; alterations to Broad Street shopfront, including provision of 2 fire escape doors and alteration in position of main entrance; provision of eight windows at proposed second floor level on Minster Street elevation; and, enlarged roof plant area, provision of additional plant screen and provision of lift overrun at third floor level. Granted following completion of deed of variation s106 legal agreement 06/10/16.
- x. 160564/ADV - Display of 3 internally illuminated fascia signs to ground floor Broad Street elevation. Granted 27/05/16.
- xi. 160567/ADV - Display of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs to the upper floors of the Broad Street elevation. Refused 27/05/16. Reason for refusal:

The proposed fascia signs, by reason of their upper floor position and size/form, would fail to respect the host building and wider streetscene, resulting in a proliferation of advertisements which would have a harmful detrimental impact on visual amenity, contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC5 (Design in the Centre) of the Reading Borough LDF Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009, Policies DM22 (Advertisements) and DM23 (Shopfronts and Cash Machines) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- xii. 161489/CLP - Use at part first floor as ancillary coffee shop (Class A1). Certificate of lawfulness issued 05/10/16.
- xiii. 161933/ADV - Display of 1 internally illuminated fascia sign to the upper floors of the Broad Street elevation. Refused 02/12/2017.

Reason for refusal: The proposed fascia sign, by reason of its upper floor position and size/form, would fail to respect the host building and wider streetscene, resulting in a proliferation of advertisements which due to clutter and duplication of signage would have a harmful detrimental impact on visual amenity, contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC5 (Design in the Centre) of the Reading Borough LDF Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009, policies DM22 (Advertisements) and DM23 (Shopfronts and Cash Machines) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Appeal APP/E0345/Z/16/3164603 dismissed 16/02/2017. The concluding paragraph of the decision states: "Although the starting point for my decision is the effect on amenity and public safety rather than the development plan, I have taken account of Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough Core Strategy (2008) (Altered 2015) and Policy RC5 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan (2009) which seek to ensure high quality public realm design. I have also taken account of Policies DM22 and DM23 of the Reading Borough Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012) that aim to protect the character and appearance of shopfronts and their surroundings. These Policies are therefore material to this case and given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with them".

- xiv. 161982/ADV - Retention of 1 internally illuminated fascia sign to the upper floors of the Broad Street elevation for a temporary period of four months. Refused 02/12/2017.

Reason for refusal: The continued display of the fascia sign for a temporary four month period, by reason of its upper floor position and size/form, fails to respect the host building and wider streetscene, resulting in a proliferation of advertisements which due to clutter and duplication of signage would have a harmful detrimental impact on visual amenity, contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC5 (Design in the Centre) of the Reading Borough LDF Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009, policies DM22 (Advertisements) and DM23 (Shopfronts and Cash Machines) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Appeal APP/E0345/Z/16/3164606 dismissed 16/02/2017 (same conclusion as 161933).

This unauthorised sign was removed from the site in July 2017.

- xv. 170764/CLP - Internal signage at second floor level on Broad Street elevation. Certificate of lawfulness (proposed) issued 07/07/2017, as the proposal was assessed against the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), and it has been confirmed that the proposal would be lawful for it falls outside the meaning of development in section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and complies with Schedule 1, Class I of the Town and Country Planning (Control of 4 Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), for which parts 2 (Deemed consent) and 3 (Express Consent) do not apply. Implemented.

6. Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

7. Discussions with applicant

Prior to the registration of the application, the exact nature of the proposal was clarified and a description of development was agreed with the agent of the applicant.

The agent of the applicant was contacted on 20th September, whereby the concerns with the proposals were outlined. The agent of the applicant was provided with a time period to withdraw the proposal. Once this passed, a courtesy email was sent, advising that the application would now be determined. The agent replied on 22nd September, as follows:

*When advising my client they were going to revert back
However they did suggest that they may want the application to run its course !*

8. Relevant Planning Legislation

- i. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for Reading relevant to the application site comprises the Reading Local Development Framework 'Core Strategy' 2008 (Altered 2015), 'Sites and Detailed Policies Document' 2012 (Altered 2015) and the 'Reading Central Area Action Plan' (2009).
- ii. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special interest which it possesses.
- iii. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority in the exercise of its functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
- iv. Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 requires the Local Planning Authority to exercise its powers under these regulations in the interests of amenity and public safety taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material; and any other relevant factors. Regulation 3 states that factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural, or similar interest.

Factors relevant to public safety include highway safety and whether the advert would hinder security or surveillance devices, including speed cameras.

9. Relevant Policies

- i. The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm

CS20 Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy

CS33 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 Safeguarding amenity

DM12 Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

DM22 Advertisements

DM23 Shopfronts and Cash Machines

Reading Centre Area Action Plan 2009

RC5 Design in the Centre

RC6 Definition of the Centre

Other documents of relevance

St Mary Butts / Castle St Conservation Area Appraisal

Market Place / London Street Conservation Area Appraisal

10. Appraisal

9.1 Background

9.2 It is noted that upper floor level signage has been refused previously at the site, including two separate proposals which were then dismissed at appeal in 2017. First, in 2011, under application reference 110119, signage was refused when the building was occupied by BHS. In spite of advertisement consent being refused, it is known that at least the upper floor Broad Street signage was nevertheless displayed at the site. This was removed when BHS vacated the site. Secondly, in 2016, two upper floor signs were refused on the Broad Street elevation (ref 160567). Thirdly/fourthly, later in 2016 a retrospective temporary retention of the previously refused (in 2016) and a separate upper level sign (refs 161982 and 161933) were individually refused in December 2016. Appeals were lodged against both refusals, with both appeals being dismissed in February 2017. The unauthorised high level sign erected at the site in 2016 was removed in July 2017, thus avoiding formal enforcement action. Also in July 2017, an internally located non-illuminated sign was displayed at second floor level, with a certificate of lawfulness issued for this in July 2017.

9.3 It is also relevant to note that prior to application 160567 being refused, two previous applications including high level signage were submitted prior to either being omitted / withdrawn. First, upper level signage was sought in 2015 under application reference 151241, but this was omitted during the course of the application. This followed officer advice to the applicant, outlining concerns with the upper level signage proposed at that time. Furthermore, another application seeking high level signage was submitted in 2016, under application reference 160100, but was withdrawn by the applicant prior to formal a decision being made by the local planning authority. Again, officers had advised the

applicant of concerns in relation to the upper level signage proposed at that time. In all instances please also see the relevant history section above for details.

9.4 Supporting statements by the applicant

9.5 The applicant has simply submitted a short document repeating the proposed plan submitted and showing some specifications (as per section 2 above)/images of the illumination proposed. Surprisingly, given the significant history, no statement referring to how this proposal was acceptable in itself / overcame concerns of the Inspector in 2017, was submitted for consideration.

9.6 The main issues are considered to be:

- Amenity
- Public Safety

9.7 Amenity

9.8 The NPPG provides a subsection entitled Considerations affecting amenity - What does "Amenity" mean? (Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306). This is reproduced in full below:

"Amenity" is not defined exhaustively in the [Town and Country Planning \(Control of Advertisements\) \(England\) Regulations 2007](#). It includes 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\(2\)\(a\)](#)).

It is, however, a matter of interpretation by the local planning authority (and the Secretary of State) as it applies in any particular case. 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.

So, 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.

This might mean that a large poster-hoarding would be refused where it would dominate a group of listed buildings, but would be permitted in an industrial or commercial area of a major city (where there are large buildings and main highways) where the advertisement would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood of the site.

If the advertisement makes a noise, aural amenity would also be taken into account before express consent would be given.

9.9 With the above in mind, it is considered to be particularly pertinent that the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 state at Paragraph 3 that: Local planning authorities are required to exercise their powers under

the Regulations with regard to amenity and public safety, taking into account relevant development plan policies in so far as they relate to amenity and public safety, and any other relevant factors.

9.10 In this case, it is the visual amenity of Broad Street and the surrounding area which is considered to be significant.

9.11 Policies CS7, DM22, DM23 and RC5 require that development be compatible with the character and appearance of the surrounding environment in order to maintain the visual amenities of the area. In particular, Policy DM22 states:

“Advertisements will respect the building or structure on which they are located and/or their surroundings and setting in terms of size, location, design, materials, colour, noise, lettering, amount and type of text, illumination and luminance, and will not have a detrimental effect on public safety. The cumulative impact of adverts will be taken into account, and a proliferation of advertisements that detrimentally affects visual or aural amenity or public safety will not be acceptable”.

9.12 The supporting text to the policy also specifies at paragraph 10.3.5 that: *“Despite the fact that the policy does not deal specifically with types of advertisements, some types are unlikely to be considered appropriate in terms of how visual amenity and safety is defined in the policy... Advertisements above ground floor level are also likely to have detrimental effects on visual amenity”.*

9.13 To supplement the supporting text, Policy DM23 is of relevance in providing further detail, as the advertisement can be considered to constitute an individual feature of a shopfront, with part b) of the policy stating *“Fascia boards should be lower than any first floor windows, and reflect the predominant height of existing fascia boards on surrounding buildings”.* Although acknowledging that technically the proposed sign is not a fascia board (given it is set within the building), for all intents and purposes it is considered to serve the same role.

9.14 With the above in mind, it is considered that part of the overwhelming character and appearance of Broad Street is the uncluttered building facades at upper level. The proposed sign at upper level, despite being set-back within the building by 1.4m (as per the section plan on drawing 200 Rev 1.3), would be harmful to the visual amenity of the building and wider streetscene, given the proposed location at upper floor level. In addition, beyond this ‘in principle’ concern (which remains unchanged from the previously refused / dismissed at appeal proposals), the proposed size/form (overly large and therefore dominating in its form - at 1.25m high, the letters are identical in size to those in application 161982, rather than the smaller 0.75m height of application 161933) of the advertisement is a further concern. In particular, the length and height of the horizontal sign at second floor level, despite the set-back within the building, is considered to be excessive (visible from a number of short/medium viewpoints) for the host building and the prevailing character elsewhere along Broad Street (acknowledging the context of the host building being larger in size/width than many along Broad Street).

9.15 It is also important to recognise that a range of signage has been approved/implemented on the Broad Street elevation under consents 151241 and 160564 at the site. Furthermore, as recently as July 2017, a certificate of lawfulness has been issued in respect of a non-illuminated version of the sign subject to this application (Ref 170764). These signs, in their present form, are considered to be sufficient for a building of this

nature in this locality, bearing in mind the commercial points the applicant raised previously in seeking to justify former proposals at the site.

- 9.16 Officers have duly considered the recent appeal decisions at the site. Whilst mindful of this application being considered on its merits, given the many parallels in the proposals (put simply, upper level signage to the Broad Street elevation) it is considered relevant to take into account and comment upon matters raised by the Inspector (see relevant history section above for appeal reference numbers):
- 9.17 The Inspector commented at paragraph 6 that *“the majority of buildings do not display fascia-type advertisements above their ground floors”*. This context remains unchanged from when the appeal decision was issued in February 2017.
- 9.18 At paragraph 7 the Inspector raised concerns about how the then proposed sign did not align with those at ground floor level: *“the building has an asymmetric frontage at ground floor level so the existing advertisement would be offset to the proposed one above it that would be more centrally placed. This would create a discordant appearance to the façade of the building”*. The now proposed sign is located in the same position as previous, albeit at a higher location (second floor rather than between first and second floor) and set within the building. As such, it is considered that this concern of the Inspector has not been addressed in this proposal. At paragraph 7 the Inspector continued that *“and because it already stands out in the street scene, the effect would be obtrusive and incongruous”*. In this regard, the set-back of the sign within the building is acknowledged to reduce its prominence in the streetscene, but despite this it is still of a size and nature (visible from a number of short and medium viewpoints along Broad Street and Cross Street) which can be considered to have the same obtrusive / incongruous effect as concluded by the Inspector on the previous proposal.
- 9.19 Paragraph 7 of the appeal decision continues *“Furthermore, the proposal would be disharmonious with the character and appearance of the area given the general absence of upper floor advertisements on buildings in the shopping street”*. It is considered that a similar criticism/conclusion can be reached on the current proposal, despite the slight mitigation of the proposed sign being set within the building. At paragraph 8 the Inspector goes on to address other examples of upper level signage along Broad Street not being applicable *“the other signage does not in my view form a notable part of the character of the area or set a precedent”*. Again, these examples (John Lewis, Oracle, Metro Bank), are acknowledged, but it is considered that there a far greater number of buildings that do not have advertisements spread over their upper floor façades. It is considered that this greater number of buildings presents the overwhelming appearance and character of Broad Street. In line with Policy DM22, the proliferation of advertisements that detrimentally affects visual amenity will not be acceptable, particularly in what is considered to be the heart of the town centre (within the Primary Shopping Area and an identified Active Frontage). The incremental impact of this would be detrimental to the appearance of the main shopping street(s), where currently there is considered to be a fine balance between building façades and signage.
- 9.20 Thus, in overall terms, the proposed advertisement is considered to be unacceptable in itself in amenity terms. In addition, it has not sufficiently responded to concerns raised by the Inspector earlier in 2017 in terms of a previous proposal, in respect of matters where it is considered the context can equally be applied to both proposals.
- 9.21 Public safety

- 9.22 The proposed fascia sign is located in a position that it is considered would not cause a significant physical obstruction to members of the public using the pedestrianised highway of Broad Street or nearby highways (either pedestrians or vehicular drivers/passengers). The applicant has detailed that the illuminated signage will have a level of luminance of 600 cd/m², which is unlikely to cause a distraction to users of the highway (with the candela level stipulated by the applicant to be secured via condition had the proposal been submitted - the level is the maximum referenced in paragraph 10.3.8 of the supporting text to policy DM22). Transport Development Control has no issues with the level specified. The proposal is not considered to compromise any existing CCTV in the local area.
- 9.23 More specifically, the NPPG (in particular in this instance Paragraph: 068 Reference ID: 18b-068-20140306 & Paragraph: 078 Reference ID: 18b-078-20140306) provides guidance as to the considerations affecting public safety. These are detailed below, together with officer responses in relation to this application in bold:

The main types of advertisement which may cause danger to road users are:

- (a) those which obstruct or impair sight-lines at corners, bends or at a junction, or at any point of access to a highway; **No**
- (b) those which, because of their size or siting, would obstruct or confuse a road-user's view, or reduce the clarity or effectiveness of a traffic sign or signal, or would be likely to distract road-users because of their unusual nature; **No**
- (c) those which effectively leave insufficient clearance above any part of a highway, or insufficient lateral clearance for vehicles on the carriageway (due allowance being made for the camber of the road-surface); **No**
- (d) those externally or internally illuminated signs (incorporating either flashing or static lights) including those utilising light emitting diode technology: **(internally illuminated / static)**
 - i. where the means of illumination is directly visible from any part of the road; **No**
 - ii. which, because of their colour, could be mistaken for, or confused with, traffic lights or any other authorised signals; **No**
 - iii. which, because of their size or brightness, could result in glare and dazzle, or distract road-users, particularly in misty or wet weather; **No, although large in size, Broad Street being pedestrianised and the sign having a luminance of 600cd/m2 downplays this element**
 - iv. which are subject to frequent changes of the display; **No**
- (e) those which incorporate moving or apparently moving elements in their display, or successive individual advertisements which do not display the whole message; **No**
- (f) those requiring close study (such as Public Information Panels), which are situated so that people looking at them would be insufficiently protected from passing vehicles; or those advertisements sited on narrow footpaths where they may interfere with safe passage by causing pedestrians to step into the road; **No**
- (g) those which resemble traffic signs, as defined in [section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#), and may therefore be subject to removal by the traffic authority under [section 69](#) of that Act, for example:
 - i. those embodying red circles, crosses or triangles, or any traffic sign symbol; or those in combinations of colours which might otherwise be mistaken for traffic signs; **No** or
 - ii. those incorporating large arrows or chevrons with only the arrow or chevron made of retroreflective material or illuminated, causing confusion with similar signs in use at, or approaching roundabouts. **No**

(h) those which embody directional or other traffic elements and which need special scrutiny because of possible resemblance to, or confusion with, traffic signs, for example, advertisements which:

- i. contain a large arrow or chevron (or have a pointed end and have only a few words of message); **No**
- ii. invite drivers to turn right on a main road, or where there is fast moving traffic; **No**
- iii. invite drivers to turn, but are sited so close to the turning that there is not enough time to signal and turn safely; **No** or
- iv. are so close to similar advertisements, or official traffic signs, that road-users might be confused in the vicinity of a road junction or other traffic hazard. **No**

The prevention of crime is a public safety consideration and local planning authorities should consider whether granting express consent could block the view of CCTV cameras, or whether illumination from an advertisement would cause glare on such cameras. **No**

9.24 As such, the proposal is not being refused advertisement consent on public safety grounds.

11. Conclusion

- i. Having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that the balance of considerations therefore weigh against the granting of advertisement consent. Therefore, on this occasion, advertisement consent is to be refused.

Recommendation

Refuse Advertisement Consent.

12. Reason for refusal:

The proposed internally illuminated internally located sign at second floor level, by reason of its upper floor position and size/form, would fail to respect the host building and wider streetscene, resulting in a proliferation of advertisements which due to clutter and duplication of signage would have a harmful detrimental impact on visual amenity, contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC5 (Design in the Centre) of the Reading Borough LDF Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009, policies DM22 (Advertisements) and DM23 (Shopfronts and Cash Machines) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Informatives

1. The decision relates to the following drawings and documents:

209 Rev 1.0 - Location and Site/Block Plan, as received 14/07/17

200 Rev 1.3 - Broad Street Signage Proposal, as received 14/07/17

Primark Reading Broad Street Signage Proposal V1, dated 12/07/17, as received 14/07/17

Email from Chart Plan 'RE: BROAD STREET ...SIGNAGE (171178)' dated and received 31/07/17

2. The decision to refuse consent follows the positive and proactive consideration of the application, including outlining the issues of concern with the applicant prior to a decision being issued and determining the application within the statutory time period.