DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0349-26**	**Applicant:**	**Smart Outdoor Limited**
Proposal:	Proposed two sided signage totem		
Location:	14-16 Winsover Centre Winsover Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	8th June 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SPALDING & DISTRICT CIVIC SOCIETY	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This proposal seeks advertisement consent for a two sided signage totem in the car park of 14-16 Winsover Centre. The signage would comprise a 2m (width) by 4m (height) LED screen on top of a 2.71m tall metal stand. The signs would be internally illuminated, and would cycle through various advertisements. The luminance would be set at 300 cd/m2 from dusk to dawn and up to 5,000 cd/m2 at all other times.

Site Description

The site is within the town centre boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is within the car park of the Winsover Centre, which contains Lidl and Poundland. Approximately 65m to the north would be the Grade II listed Spalding train station. This site occupies a prominent view of the Station as one travels south to north.

Relevant History

No relevant history

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Spalding and District Civic Society

We basically have no objection to the proposal as we want to give shopping every chance in the town. We do however feel that there should be a restriction on the illuminosity in the evenings and at night and that no fleshing images should be used which might distract drivers and occupiers in nearby Glenn Avenue. The above measures would also limit the impact on the setting of the nearby railway station listed building

Conservation Officer

We have no objections to this proposal on built heritage grounds. It is requested that the signage is dimmed during hours of darkness to reduce its visual impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Railway Station

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

No objection - The advertisement proposals will not present a danger or distraction for road users therefore the Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would result in a severe impact with regard to Highway Safety.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area and Heritage and Conservation

Policy Context - Design

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should

function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations.

Paragraph 141 of the NPPF states: "The quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. A separate consent process within the planning system controls the display of advertisements, which should be operated in a way which is simple, efficient and effective. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts."

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

Policy Context - Heritage

In assessing proposals of this nature, the Local Planning Authority must ensure special regard to preserving the Listed Buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act'). No harm should be caused with the historical assets and their surroundings requiring to be preserved or enhanced.

The NPPF expresses the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets; advising that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

Section 16 of the NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

Policy 29 (The Historic Environment) states amongst other matters that the distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced, in keeping with the policies in the NPPF. Development proposals will be expected to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy 29 is broken into five interrelated sections, with part A relevant here

Policy 29A, relating to listed buildings, states: "Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

Assessment

The proposal would occupy a prominent position as one travels to the Grade II listed train station from Spalding town centre, having a degree of change upon views of the building as a result. However, the advertisement would be positioned behind an existing fence, within the Winsover Centre car park. There would also be a significant enough distance between the signage and the

listed asset. On that basis, a degree of visual separation would be created between the proposed signage and the train station. This is considered to prevent an adverse impact upon the asset.

Signage of this nature is not currently wide spread in the area, although there are some examples in the forecourt of Sainsburys. The area is clearly commercial in nature, and is of limited aesthetic quality, beyond the train station building which as previously established would read independently from this site. The lack of comparable signage in the area would prevent a perceived over proliferation. Likewise, the lack of clearly defined aesthetic quality reduces the bar for harm to the character of the area.

Limits on the scope of illumination, as recommended by the Conservation Officer and the Applicant's own submission, would help to further minimise the impact of development.

On balance, whilst the design is of no quality and would not enhance the area, it would not harm the character of the area or the impact upon the setting of the listed building as to harm its significance.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

There are limited residential units in the area. The use of a condition to restrict luminance would ensure an absence of harm.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 116 advises that "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal. Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

The advertisement is sufficiently set back from the road, and sufficiently dim, to prevent a harmful impact, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, and 33 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance

Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 states local planning authorities shall 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.

Whilst the proposal would not enhance the area, it would equally not harm it either. On balance, it is

considered that the proposal is acceptable.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:
A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).
C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 2, 3, and 29 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.