

COMMITTEE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 29th MAY 2019

Ward: Abbey

App Nos.: 181954/ADV, 181955/ADV, 181956/ADV, 181957/ADV, 181958/ADV, 191959/ADV, 181961/ADV, 181962/ADV, 181963/ADV, 181964/ADV, 181965/ADV, 181966/ADV, 181967/ADV, 181968/ADV and 190361/ADV

Addresses:

- Sign 1 - 181954 - outside 37-45 Station Road(Thames Tower)
- Sign 2 - 181955 - outside 17-27 Station Road (Brunel House)
- Sign 3 - 181956 - outside 3-5 Station Road (Coral)
- Sign 4 - 181957 - outside 24-25 Broad Street (HSBC)
- Sign 5 - 181958 - outside 26-28 Broad Street (Lloyds Bank)
- Sign 6 - 181959 - outside 123 Broad Street (Fat Face/ Broad Street Oracle entrance)
- Sign 7 - 181961 - outside 23 Broad Street (Trailfinders)
- Sign 8 - 181962 - outside 108-113 Broad Street (John Lewis)
- Sign 9 - 181963 - outside 39 Broad Street (WHSmith)
- Sign 10- 181964 - outside 52 Broad Street (JD Sports)
- Sign 11 - 181965 - outside 61-64 Broad Street (Clas Ohlson)
- Sign 12 - 181966 - outside 31 Queen Victoria Street (Iitsu)
- Sign 13 - 181967 - outside 2 Queen Victoria Street (Salvo and Alex for Men)
- Sign 14 - 181968 - outside 116-117 Broad Street (Primark)
- Sign 15 - 190361 - outside 11 Broad Street (Monsoon/ Tiger)

Proposals:

Signs 1-5: Bus shelter signs. Signs 6-15: Free standing signs

Description:

Double-sided freestanding forum structure, featuring 2 x Digital 86" screen positioned back to back. The Digital screen is capable of displaying illuminated, sequential content, supplied via secure remote connection (x 15)

Applicant: JCDecaux

Date validated: 27th November 2018

Minor application 8 week target decision date: 22nd January 2019 & 26th April 2019
(for application 190361)

Extension of time: 5th June 2019 (for all applications)

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT Advertisement consent for the following applications:

All replacement bus shelter screens (Signs 1-5):

Conditions for screens 1-3 (Station Road)

1. In accordance with approved plans

2. Standard Advertisement Conditions
3. Luminance not to exceed 250 cd/m² between 17:00 to 06:00 hours
4. Luminance not to exceed 600 cd/m² between 06:01- 16:59 hours
5. No flashing or audio
6. Screens facing oncoming traffic on Station Road will be static and will not change more frequently than once every 10 seconds for the duration of operation. No animation/ video will be permitted on the screens facing oncoming traffic.

Informatives to include:

1. Terms and Conditions
2. Positive and Proactive
3. Works to the highway

Conditions for signs 4, 5, (bus shelter screens) and free standing screens nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 14 and 15

1. In accordance with approved plans
2. Standard Advertisement Conditions
3. Luminance not to exceed 250 cd/m² between 17:00 to 06:00 hours
4. Luminance not to exceed 600 cd/m² between 06:01- 16:59 hours
5. Static digital adverts will not change more frequently than once every 10 seconds on Broad Street
6. Animated adverts cannot be displayed between 07.00-10.00am each day on Broad Street
7. No flashing images or audio

Informatives to include:

1. Terms and Conditions
2. Positive and Proactive
3. Works to the highway

REFUSE advertisement consent for free standing screens 6, 7, 12 and 13 for the following reasons:

Sign 6 (Outside Fat Face/ Broad Street Oracle entrance) - The proposed double sided advertisement screen is positioned in an area of Broad Street that is relatively poorly covered in terms of CCTV camera surveillance. The structure would further obscure pedestrians behind the screen and therefore would pose a security risk. Therefore the proposal does not comply with Policies DM22 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012, altered 2015) and CS7 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (altered 2015).

Sign 7 (Outside Trailfinders, 23 Broad Street) - The proposed double sided advertisement screen is positioned in an area of Broad Street that is relatively poorly covered in terms of CCTV camera surveillance. The structure would further obscure pedestrians behind the screen and therefore would pose a security risk. Therefore the proposal does not comply with Policies DM22 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012, altered 2015) and

CS7 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (altered 2015)

Signs 12 and 13 (Outside 31 Queen Victoria Street and Outside 2 Queen Victoria Street)

The proposed double sided advertisement screen is positioned in an area that is relatively poorly covered in terms of CCTV camera surveillance. The structure would further obscure pedestrians behind the screen and therefore would pose a security risk. Therefore the proposal does not comply with Policies DM22 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012, altered 2015) and CS7 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (altered 2015). In addition it is considered that the screen will cause will cause substantial harm to the setting of the surrounding Grade II listed buildings. Therefore the proposal does not comply with Policy CS33 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012, altered 2015).

Informatives to include:

1. Pre-app
2. Positive and Proactive

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The applications relate to the erection of 15 digital advertising screens. 5 of these screens are to be located on the end of bus shelters (with the existing bus shelters to be replaced) and the remaining 10 would be free standing digital screens. The proposed screens are to be located in Broad Street, Station Road and Queen Victoria Street. These are streets which are heavily used by pedestrians (Queen Victoria Street and Broad Street are pedestrianised and Station Road has high peak-time footfall) and all are covered by a satisfactory CCTV network. For security reasons and as advised by the Council's Emergency Planning Manager, this report will not identify all locations of Reading CCTV cameras, but will discuss the impact/effect on camera surveillance in general terms only.
- 1.2 A map illustrating the locations of the proposed signs can be found at Appendix A. An image of the proposed free standing screen and the proposed bus shelter/ screen can be found at the end of this report.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 These applications seek advertisement consent for 15 double sided LED digital advertising screens.
- 2.2 The digital screens are to be controlled via secure remote connection. Both static and 'animated' adverts ie. to change no more frequently than once

every ten seconds are proposed to be shown on the screens. This will not include audio or flashing images.

- 2.3 The screens cumulatively would form a network of digital advertising that is designed to display to pedestrian footfall arriving from the railway station and then travelling up to Broad Street. It should be noted that these proposed advertising screens are being proposed by the applicant in partnership with Reading Borough Council and as such, income will be generated for the Council. Proposed methods of income generation were outlined and approved by members of the Policy Committee in December 2016 within the 'Budget Proposals 2017-2020 To Narrow The Budget Gap' report. One of these methods was advertising.
- 2.4 Without approval for all screens, the applicant has advised that the advertising scheme may not be viable and none of the screens implemented.
- 2.5 5 of these screens are to be located on the end of bus shelters (3 on Station Road and 2 on Broad Street). The bus shelters themselves are also to be upgraded, however the upgrading of the shelters is a separate matter between the applicant and Reading Buses and this would be 'permitted development' for relevant infrastructure on the public highway. Therefore it is only the location of the digital screens to be located at the end of the new shelters that is a matter for consideration in this report.
- 2.6 The remaining 10 double sided screens are to be free standing in various locations around Broad Street and Queen Victoria Street and these be sited perpendicular to the street, to maximise their visibility to passing pedestrians.
- 2.7 The proposed free standing screens would measure around 1.4m in width, 2.1m in height and would be set upon a 0.8m high stand/ plinth. Therefore the screens would have a total height of around 2.9m. The proposed bus shelter screens would measure around 1.6m in width and 2.7m total height.
- 2.8 It is proposed that the LED screens would display static and animated advertisements which would be in place for 10 seconds at a time before merging into a new image. The screens are proposed to operate 24 hours.
- 2.9 The details submitted as part of the application also indicate that the luminance of the screens would be controlled via sensors which automatically adjust depending upon prevailing natural light conditions whilst ensuring the luminance levels reduce during the evenings. The screens would operate at low luminance (250cd/m²) between 17:00 and 06:00 hours. Outside of these hours, the luminance will increase to 600cd/m².

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 As the proposed sites are not located to a particular address, planning history is somewhat limited. However there are schemes of a similar nature that have been implemented around the town centre, albeit in slightly different locations. These applications are set out below:

162267 (Oracle Riverside)- Digital LED double sided totem screen located to the north side of the river - Advertisement Consent granted.

162266 (Oracle Riverside) - Digital LED double sided totem screen located to the north side of the river - Advertisement Consent granted.

162270 (Oracle Riverside) - Digital LED double sided totem screen located to the north side of the river - Advertisement Consent granted.

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 RBC Environmental Protection - No objections, subject to conditions to secure regarding illumination and no audio/ flashing images.

4.2 RBC Transport - Provided individual comments on all applications and comments are made in the Appraisal below

4.3 RBC Heritage Consultant - Raises objection to the two proposed signs in Queen Victoria Street due to detrimental impact on the setting of the listed buildings in the street.

4.4 Thames Valley Police (TVP)/ CCTV - Thames Valley Police has no objections to signs 1-5 (bus shelter screens) as these were not considered any more harmful than the existing advertising presently located on the end of shelters. TVP initially objected to signs 6-15.

Following a re-evaluation of the proposals, TVP withdrew their initial objections to signs 6-15. TVP concluded that due to the existing obstructions in the town centre, these added obstructions would only result in a further minimal impact for the cameras. TVP was also satisfied that the camera footage would not be hindered if the illumination levels of the screens can be controlled by condition. TVP's previous objections were withdrawn on the provision that if the CCTV operators at TVP find that the screens are causing an adverse impact on camera coverage, that the issue will be addressed by the applicant accordingly.

However it should be noted that if consent is granted, the ability of the LPA to take action is limited only to what is enforceable by planning condition. Therefore, should TVP conclude once in place, that a screen is physically blocking camera

vision, this will not be able to automatically be addressed via the planning system, as TVP wishes.

4.5 Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) Thames Valley Police - Suggested that the proposed screens could be modified so that they stand on two 'legs' as opposed to having a solid base. This was due to concern that the structures could be used to hide behind. Having a base that is not solid will allow pedestrians to know if someone is stood behind the screen. The CPDA also suggested that the screens could be rotated 90 degrees to better sit in relation to the CCTV cameras. The applicant was not willing to make these suggested amendments to any of the proposed free standing screens, due to the equipment needed in the base and their requirement for visibility of the signs to pedestrians.

4.6 Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) - CAAC was consulted on application 190361 (sign 15) as the proposed location of this screen sits within the Market Place/ London Street conservation area. No response was received.

4.7 Public Consultation:

15 site notices were displayed at the approximate locations of the proposed screens. The consultation period ended on 21st December 2018 (for signs 1-14) and 1st April 2019 (for sign 15). One objection was received from a member of the public in relation to application sign 6 and the following concerns were raised:

- The proposed structure will add clutter to Broad Street and will be visually detrimental to the streetscape.
- The proposed structure would also be an obstruction in an area that is heavily used by pedestrians.

5. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 apply.

5.1 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.

5.2 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.

- 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
 - Part 12: Achieving well designed places
 - Part 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- 5.4 National Planning Practice Guidance
 - Advertisements
- 5.5 Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (altered 2015)
 - CS7: Design and the Public Realm
 - CS33: Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment
- 5.6 Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012) (Altered 2015)
 - DM4: Safeguarding Amenity
 - DM12: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
 - DM22: Advertisements
- 5.7 Reading Central Area Action Plan (adopted 2009)
 - RC5: Design in the Centre
 - RC14: Public Realm

6. APPRAISAL

6.1 Legislative context

As set out above under the advertisement regulations factors relevant to public safety include highway safety and whether the adverts would hinder security or surveillance devices. The relevant considerations for this application with regard to public safety are highway safety and crime prevention, including whether granting consent could block the view of CCTV cameras, or whether illumination from an advertisement would cause glare on such cameras. The second issue is the impact on amenity and this also includes impact on street scene and heritage assets. In considering these applications, officers are satisfied that the screens proposed would not have an adverse impact on any residential amenities of occupiers of the town centre (Policy DM4 applies).

6.2 Planning Policy

Policy DM22 (Advertisements) states that advertisements will not have a detrimental impact on public safety. It also specifies that the cumulative impact of adverts will be taken into account. Policy CS7 (Design) seeks that all development should create safe and accessible environments. Policy DM12 (Highway Matters) states that development will only be permitted where it is not detrimental to highway safety. Policy CS20 (Reading Transport Strategy) seeks to promote transport safety.

6.3 Appraisal of each sign

This appraisal will discuss the 15 signs in the following way:

- a) Signs 1-3 (Station Road bus shelter screens)
- b) Signs 4-5 (Broad Street bus shelter screens); then
- c) Signs 6-15 will be individually discussed

6.4 Signs 1-3 (Bus shelters, Station Road)

6.4(a) Consultee Comments:

- i) **Transport** - No objections subject to conditions
- ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

6.4(b) The current bus shelters are to be replaced in the same position as currently exists and the proposed double-sided screens are to be located on the end of the replacement bus shelters. At present, the bus shelters have a screen which displays non- illuminated, non- digitalised advertisements.

6.4(c) It is not considered that the replacement of a non-digitalised screen with a digital screen will be substantially harmful to the overall street scene. The precedence of advertising has already been set on the end of bus shelters in these locations, and the upgrading of these to digital screens is not considered to cause more harm than those which already exist.

6.4(d) It is not considered that the proposals would adversely impact the setting of listed buildings within the vicinity.

6.4(e) Transport Strategy has raised concern over the proposed animation and the impact this would have on highway users, e.g. bus and taxi drivers. A condition is included to restrict the frequency of changing adverts displayed, in particular facing oncoming traffic. The screens facing oncoming traffic will have static adverts that do not change more frequently than 10 seconds for the duration of operation. Animated adverts will not be permitted on the screens facing oncoming traffic. In addition, the screens' luminance levels will not be more than 600 cd/m².

6.4(f) The locations are considered acceptable in relation to CCTV cameras and therefore will not impact sight lines and surveillance.

6.4(g) As such, applications 181954, 181955 and 181956 are recommended to be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because they are considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and they comply with Policy DM22.

6.5 Signs 4 and 5 (ReadiBus shelters, Broad Street)

6.5(a) Consultee Comments

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition
- ii) **TVP/CCTV** - No objections

6.5(b) The current bus shelters are to be replaced in the same position as currently exists. The proposed double sided screens are to be located on the end of the replacement Readibus shelters. At present, the bus shelters possess a screen which displays advertisements, however at present the displays are not digitalised.

6.5(c) It is not considered that the replacement of a non-digitalised screen with a digital screen will be substantially harmful to the overall street scene. The precedence of advertising in Broad Street which is a pedestrianised retail high street has already been set on the end of bus shelters in these locations, and the upgrading of these to digital screens is not considered to cause more harm than those which already exist.

6.5(d) Transport Strategy has raised concern over the proposed animation and the impact this would have on delivery drivers servicing Broad Street. A condition is recommended that the static adverts shall not change frequency more than once every 10 seconds. Animated digital adverts will not be permitted to be shown between 07:00-10:00am each day in the interests of not further distracting delivery drivers on Broad Street. Outside of these hours, animated adverts will not change more than once every 10 seconds. In addition, luminance levels are proposed to be restricted to 600 cd/m².

6.5(e) The locations are considered acceptable in relation to CCTV cameras and therefore will not impact sight lines and surveillance and replace current infrastructure of a similar size and form.

6.5(f) As such, applications 181957 and 181958 are recommended to be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because they are considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and comply with Policy DM22.

6.6 Sign 6 (Free standing sign outside 123 Broad Street - near Oracle entrance on Broad Street)

6.6(a) Consultee Comments:

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition and informative
- ii) **TVP/CCTV** - No objections

6.6(b) The proposed screen would be located approximately 4m away from the Broad Street entrance of The Oracle.

6.6(c) This entrance receives a high amount of footfall due to its connection between the shopping centre and Broad Street and thus clear and easy access

between these areas is required. An objector is concerned that the proposed screen would cause clutter and obstruction to pedestrians. Near the entrance to The Oracle there is the supporting pole for The Oracle canopy which is located 5.5 m away from the proposed location of the screen. An information sign for the Oracle is also positioned beyond the pole. These are considered to be sufficiently distant to ensure that the proposal would not result in an obstruction to pedestrians.

6.6(d) RBC Transport does not have concerns subject to conditions relating to restrictions on animation and luminance levels.

6.6(e) CCTV: TVP does not raise an objection to the application. However planning officers have concerns that coverage from CCTV cameras in the vicinity is relatively poor. The western facing side of the screen would not be covered by CCTV cameras and other camera coverage is obscured. Thus, on balance, officers consider that this screen would result in an unnecessary security risk as pedestrians have the potential to be concealed.

6.6(f) Therefore application 181959 is recommended for refusal of advertisement consent because it is not acceptable in terms of public safety for the reasons above and is considered to be contrary to Policies DM22 and CS7.

6.7 **Sign 7 (Free standing sign outside 23 Broad Street - Trailfinders)**

6.7(a) Consultee Comments

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to conditions and informative
- ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

6.7(b) The proposed screen would be located approximately 5m south of the Trailfinders shop; 5.5m from the stone seating area which occupies the centre of Broad Street between Trailfinders and M&S.

6.7(c) It is considered that the proposed screen is adequately positioned in relation to the stone seating area, leaving enough space for pedestrians to navigate between the proposed and existing street furniture. The screen would not unduly detract from the spaciousness of this area, quality of the public realm or frontages of surrounding buildings. Therefore there are no conflicts in terms of design or public realm policies.

6.7(d) Transport Strategy does not raise any objections to the application, subject to a condition that the luminance of the screen will not exceed 600 cd/m².

6.7(e) CCTV: Although TVP raises no objections, officers consider that this section of Broad Street is relatively poorly covered in terms of CCTV camera surveillance. Other cameras are comparatively distant and the screen would be sighted so as to obscure pedestrians behind the screen, albeit at a distance.

6.7(f) On balance, officers consider that this sign raises an unnecessary security risk to pedestrians and therefore application 181961 is recommended for refusal of advertisement consent because it is not acceptable in terms of public safety for the reasons given above and is contrary to Policies DM22 and CS7.

6.8 Sign 8 (Free standing, outside 108-113 Broad Street - John Lewis)

6.8(a) Consultee Comments:

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition
- ii) **TVP/CCTV** - No objections

6.8(b) The proposed screen will be located approximately 4.2m from the frontage of the John Lewis department store.

6.8(c) An existing advertising screen (which is on the back of a BT telephone kiosk) is located approximately 22m east of the proposed location of the screen. Given the distance between the proposed screen and the existing, it is not considered that it will result in a proliferation of advertising screens within close proximity. Other forms of street furniture are limited around this location and therefore it is not considered that the sign would cause obstruction or clutter. Therefore it is considered the screen would not unduly detract from the spaciousness of this area, quality of the public realm or frontages of surrounding buildings.

6.8(d) Transport Strategy has raised no objections subject to similar servicing-related safety conditions regarding restrictions on animation and luminance.

6.8(e) CCTV: both TVP and your planning officers consider that in this section of Broad Street, the distance to cameras and the orientation of the screen means there is a good sight line both sides of the screen.

6.8(f) It is therefore recommended that application 181962 be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because it is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and it complies with Policy DM22.

6.9 Sign 9 (Free standing sign outside 39 Broad Street - WHSmith)

6.9(a) Consultee Comments

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition and informative
- ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

6.9(b) The proposed screen will be located 3.5m from the frontage of WHSmith.

6.9(c) It is considered that the screen would not unduly detract from the spaciousness of this part of Broad Street. The area is not in close proximity to existing street furniture and therefore no conflict is advised in terms of design and public realm policies.

6.9(d) It is acknowledged that no. 38/39 is a Grade II listed building (it is part of the same listed group as on Queen Victoria Street). However, given the nature and location of the screen and the setting of the listed building being predominantly a busy commercial shopping street, it is not considered a particularly historically sensitive location.

6.9(e) Transport Strategy has no objections to the proposal subject to conditions relating to restrictions on animation and luminance.

6.9(f) CCTV: TVP considers that camera coverage in this area is satisfactory. Your planning officers agree.

6.9(g) Therefore application 181963 is recommended to be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because it is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and it complies with Policy DM22.

6.10 Sign 10 (Free standing sign outside 52 Broad Street - JD Sports/former H&M shop)

6.10(a) Consultee Comments

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition and informative
- ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

6.10(b) The proposed screen will be located 3.9m from the frontage of JD Sports.

6.10(c) It is considered the screen would not unduly detract from the spaciousness of this area, quality of the public realm or frontages of surrounding buildings. Nearby is a lamppost with integrated seating and an area with large raised seating and a metal sculpture. These are all sufficiently distant from the proposed location of the screen so as not to cause obstruction or design issues.

6.10(d) Transport Strategy has no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

6.10(e) TVP raises no objections however your officers note that sight line from the camera is not ideal and there is partial obstruction of pedestrians on the western side. However on balance, your officers agree that the level of concealment would be minor and not so substantial as to warrant a refusal of this application.

6.10(f) Therefore application 181964 is recommended to be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because it is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and it complies with Policy DM22.

6.11 Sign 11 (Free standing sign outside 61-64 Broad Street - Clas Ohlson)

6.11(a) Consultee Comments:

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition and informative
- ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

6.11(b) The proposed screen will be located 3.4m from the frontage of Clas Ohlson.

6.11(c) The proposed location is not presently cluttered with street furniture and therefore this addition is not considered to unduly detract from the spaciousness of this area, quality of the public realm or frontages of surrounding buildings.

6.11(d) Transport Strategy recommend conditions relating to restrictions on animation and luminance levels.

6.11(e) TVP considers that the location of the screen would be suitable. Cameras are positioned so that both sides of the screen can be monitored and therefore is not considered that the proposal would result in the concealment of pedestrians. Your officers agree that this sign poses no significant safety or other concerns,

6.11(f) Therefore application 181965 is recommended to be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because it is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and it complies with Policy DM22.

6.12 Sign 12 - (Free standing screen outside 31 Queen Victoria Street - Itsu)
Sign 13 - (Free standing screen outside 66-67 Queen Victoria Street)

6.12(a) Consultee Comments

- i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition and informative
- ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections
- iii) **Reading Borough Council Heritage Consultant** - Objection

6.12(b) Queen Victoria Street is characterised by Grade II listed buildings either side of the street (east and west). It is grandest street in central Reading.

6.12(c) A Heritage statement was submitted by the applicant for both applications 181966 and 181967. The applicant's heritage statement suggests that the two signs on Queen Victoria Street would have a 'neutral impact' on the area and will not undermine the integrity of the heritage asset, due to the ever-changing retail street scene.

6.12(d) The Council's Heritage consultant raises objection to these applications as the screens are considered visually intrusive and would detract from the settings of the Queen Victoria Street Listed Buildings and thus harm their significance. Due to the incongruity of the screens within the street scene and their potential disturbance to the harmony and prominence of the Listed Buildings, the proposals are not considered to be consistent with their location.

6.12(e) In terms of impact on heritage assets, it is not considered that the addition of these digital advertising screens on Queen Victoria Street is appropriate. It should be noted that unlike other parts of the town centre, Queen Victoria Street remains largely clear of extraneous advertising in the street, with signage relating

to shopfronts only. The heritage statement submitted has failed to refer to Policy CS33 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which states that, 'historic features and areas of historic importance and other elements of the historic environment, including their settings, will be protected and where appropriate enhanced'. It is not considered that the proposed screens would protect or enhance the setting of the listed buildings and would pose visually intrusive structures (due to their scale) and illumination that would detract from the appearance of the listed buildings.

6.12(f) RBC Transport Strategy has no objections to these two screens subject to conditions regarding animation and luminance. Such controls would also be required to restrict animation etc. in order to minimise impact on the setting of the listed buildings. Whilst these matters could be controlled by condition, this does not overcome the concerns above regarding the suitability of presence of the structures within the street scene.

6.12(g) TVP has no objections to either screen proposed in Queen Victoria Street. The view is that albeit there are distances involved, but sides of each sign will have camera surveillance. However your officers still have concerns that the screens pose an unnecessary obstruction in terms of views up and down Queen Victoria Street. As mentioned, Queen Victoria Street remains relatively free from street clutter in comparison to Broad Street and therefore at present, the camera views in this location are not considered to be as obstructed as other locations. Due to the size and location of the screens relative to the cameras and the perpendicular siting and lack of visibility below them), officers consider that pedestrians could be concealed behind the screens. Unlike the case in Broad Street, where there are already various obstructions, here, there are relatively few, so the effect on personal security is greater. On balance, officers consider these two screens to pose an unnecessary security risk.

6.12(h) As such, both applications 181966 and 181967 are considered to result in an unnecessary security risk as pedestrians have the potential to be concealed by the screens. In addition the screens are considered to adversely impact the setting of the Grade II Listed Buildings on Queen Victoria Street. Therefore these applications are recommended to be refused advertisement consent for the reasons given above as they are contrary to Policies DM22, CS7 and CS33.

6.13 Sign 14 (Free standing sign outside 116-117 Broad Street- Primark)

6.13(a) Consultee Comments

i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition

ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

6.13(b) The proposed screen is located around 4m away from the frontage of Primark.

6.13(c) An existing advertising screen (which is on the back of a BT telephone kiosk) is located approximately 22m west of the proposed location of the screen. Given the distance between the proposed screen and the existing kiosk, it is not considered that it will result in a proliferation of advertising close to each other. Other forms of street furniture are limited around this location and therefore it is not considered to cause obstruction or clutter.

6.13(d) Transport Strategy has no objection subject to conditions regarding restrictions on animation and luminance.

6.13(e) TVP raised no objections. Your officers also consider that that both sides of the screen can be monitored satisfactorily.

6.13(f) Therefore it is recommended that application 181968 be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because it is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and it complies with Policy DM22.

6.14 Sign 15 (Free standing sign outside Monsoon/ Tiger)

6.14(a) Consultee Comments

i) **Transport** - No objection subject to condition

ii) **TVP/ CCTV** - No objections

ii) **Heritage** - No objection

iv) **CAAC** - No response received

6.14(b) The proposed screen is located around 5.5m away from the frontage of the Monsoon/ Tiger shop. The site is located within the Market Place / London Street Conservation area.

6.14(c) The proposed location is not presently cluttered with street furniture and therefore this addition is not considered to unduly detract from the spaciousness of this area, quality of the public realm or frontages of surrounding buildings. It would be located approximately 8.9m east of the existing stone seating.

6.14(d) The Council's Heritage Consultant does not raise any objections to this screen. Officers do not consider that this location, although within the conservation area, would result in an adverse effect on the setting of the conservation area or Grade II listed buildings located approximately 36m to the east (2, 3 and 3A- The Alehouse). Given the location of the screen and the setting of the conservation area/ listed building being predominantly a busy commercial shopping street, it is not considered a particularly historically sensitive location. No conflict is raised with Policy CS33.

6.14(e) Transport Strategy has raised no objections subject to similar servicing related safety conditions regarding restrictions on animation and luminance.

6.14(f) TVP raised no objection. Officers also consider that the proposed screen would not be considered to substantially block the view of nearby CCTV cameras. Both sides of the screen will be able to be monitored and therefore it is not considered that pedestrians will be concealed behind the screen.

6.14(g) Therefore it is recommended that application 190361 be granted advertisement consent, with conditions, because it is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and public safety and it complies with Policy DM22.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 These 15 applications were not submitted with the benefit of pre-application advice. In terms of impact on highway safety these applications raise few concerns and any issues can be dealt with by condition.

7.2 However, some of the signs are proposed in Queen Victoria Street, which is a particularly sensitive environment with Listed Buildings along its length, currently uncluttered by signage within the street itself. The siting of the proposed screens within the street would be detrimental to the setting of these listed buildings and the character of the street.

7.3 Some screens are considered by officers to raise security issues. This stems from a combination of their unacceptable siting in relation to existing security camera coverage/infrastructure and these large screens providing opportunity for pedestrian concealment which is considered by officers to pose an unnecessary security risk. Officers have been positive and proactive in dealing with these applications by suggesting mitigation measures to address some of the concerns raised. Rotating all or even some of the free standing screens 90 degrees was suggested to help address this issue; however the applicant was not willing to make this adjustment to any of the proposed free standing screens. Officers have also considered the extent to which the present CCTV system could be reviewed in order to reduce instances where concealment has led to several of these applications presently being unsupportable in security terms. But such has not been offered within the scope of these applications for advertisement consent.

7.4 In conclusion, officers recommend that advertisement consent can be granted for 11 of the advertisement consent applications (5 bus shelter signs and 6 free standing screens) but consent should be refused for the remaining 4 free standing screens.

7.5 In determining these applications the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation. It is considered that there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the current application) that the protected groups would have different needs,

experiences, issues and priorities in relation to these particular advertisement applications.

Case Officer: Connie Davis

Documents considered:

181954 (Sign 1)

Bus Shelter: Design Norman Foster Technical Description
Structure Design Foster Bus Shelter and Forum Panel
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Digital ad shelter 1:1250

Digital ad shelter 1:200

Received 17th January 2019

181955 (Sign 2)

Bus Shelter: Design Norman Foster Technical Description
Structure Design Foster Bus Shelter and Forum Panel
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Digital ad shelter 1:1250

Digital ad shelter 1:200

Received 17th January 2019

181956 (Sign 3)

Bus Shelter: Design Norman Foster Technical Description
Structure Design Foster Bus Shelter and Forum Panel
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Digital ad shelter 1:1250

Digital ad shelter 1:200

Received 17th January 2019

181957 (Sign 4)

Bus Shelter: Design Norman Foster Technical Description
Structure Design Foster Bus Shelter and Forum Panel
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Digital ad shelter 1:1250

Digital ad shelter 1:200

Received 17th January 2019

181958 (Sign 5)

Bus Shelter: Design Norman Foster Technical Description
Structure Design Foster Bus Shelter and Forum Panel
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Digital ad shelter 1:1250

Digital ad shelter 1:200

Received 17th January 2019

181959 (Sign 6)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Digital CIP Scale 1:200
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Structure Design Forum Panel

Received 27th November 2018

181961 (Sign 7)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Digital CIP Scale 1:200
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Structure Design Forum Panel

Received 27th November 2018

181962 (Sign 8)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Structure Design Forum Panel

Received 27th November 2018

Digital CIP Scale 1:200 Revised

Received 6th March 2019

181963 (Sign 9)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Digital CIP Scale 1:200
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018
Structure Design Forum Panel
Received 27th November 2018

181964 (Sign 10)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018
Digital CIP Scale 1:200 Revised
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Received 5th February 2019

181965 (Sign 11)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Digital CIP Scale 1:200
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018
Structure Design Forum Panel
Received 27th November 2018

181966 (Sign 12)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Digital CIP Scale 1:200
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018
Structure Design Forum Panel
Received 27th November 2018
Heritage Statement
Received 7th February 2019

181967 (sign 13)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description
Digital CIP Scale 1:1250
Digital CIP Scale 1:200
Photographs

Received 12th November 2018
Structure Design Forum Panel
Received 27th November 2018
Heritage Statement
Received 7th February 2019

181968 (Sign 14)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description

Digital CIP Scale 1:1250

Digital CIP Scale 1:200

Photographs

Received 12th November 2018

Structure Design Forum Panel

Received 27th November 2018

Digital CIP Scale 1:200 Revised

Received 6th March 2019

190361 (Sign 15)

Outdoor LCD 2m2 double sided digital unit Forum Model Technical Description

Digital CIP Scale 1:1250

Digital CIP Scale 1:200 Revised

Photographs

Received 1st March 2019



Proposed free standing screen



Proposed bus shelter and screen