



Appeal Decision

by Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 19/10/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04533-F6N0P0

Site address: 55 Chepstow Road, Newport NP19 8BX

- The appeal is made under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 against conditions imposed when granting express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Newport City Council.
 - The application Ref 25/0334 is dated 29 April 2025.
 - The 'additional' condition in dispute is No 2 which states: "*The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 600 candela per square metre between the hours of sunrise and sunset or exceed 300 candela per square metre between the hours of sunset and sunrise, in accordance with the terms of the Institution of Lighting Professionals, Professional Lighting Guide (2014) recommendations for maximum luminance*".
 - The reason given for the condition is "*In the interests of visual amenity and highway safety*".
 - A site visit was made on 7 October 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the express consent Ref 25/0334 for advertisement consent for 1no. digital display sign at land at 55 Chepstow Road, Newport NP19 8BX, granted on 12 June 2025 by Newport City Council, is varied by deleting 'additional' condition No 2 and imposing the following condition in its place:
- 2) In the hours of darkness, the advertisement display luminance shall be no greater than 300cd/m² in accordance with the recommended maximum nighttime luminance value set out for Environmental Zone 4 in Table 10.4 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals' Professional Lighting Guide 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (PLG 05) (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m². In daylight hours, the advertisement display luminance shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions (to ensure it is neither too bright or too dull), and shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in Table 10.5 within PLG 05 (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the information on the appeal form, I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice, which is more succinct and accurate.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether condition No 2 is reasonable and necessary in the interests of amenity and public safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is occupied by an existing advertising hoarding which is located next to a railway viaduct and faces onto Chepstow Road. Opposite the site are residential buildings which predominantly accommodate flats.
5. Regarding the illumination of advertisements, Technical Advice Note (TAN) 8 'Outdoor Advertisement Control' says that planning authorities should have regard to available guidance, referencing the second edition of the Institute of Lighting Engineers' Technical Report No 5. That guidance was superseded in 2014 by the Institution of Lighting Professionals' (ILP) 'Professional Lighting Guide (PLG) 05'. In 2023 this was in turn replaced by an updated version.
6. The disputed condition (No 2) was imposed in the context of the 2014 version of PLG 05. The guidance in relation to night-time luminance limits is little changed between the two versions of the documents. The appellant assents to the imposed limit of 300 cd/m² between sunset and sunrise. I agree that this is necessary.
7. The dispute relates to the imposed daytime limit of 600 cd/m². PLG 05/23 notes that while adequate for low ambient daylight levels, this limit does not allow for higher ambient conditions as found on bright days. Instead, it recommends that a control device monitors ambient daylight levels and adjusts luminance accordingly. A table featuring six categories of ambient daylight and associated maximum sign luminance is identified against which a condition to control luminance could be enforced if necessary.
8. The Council contends that the proposed maximum luminance of 5000 cd/m² would result in an excessively bright light source. The appellant notes that at this level of luminance the display would appear white but that this would occur only in direct sunlight. In practice this is unlikely to occur frequently as the advertising content would be indecipherable. Whilst the Council notes that previous appeal decisions have limited daytime luminance to 600 cd/m², it is reasonable to assume that these predate the revised ILP guidance.
9. I concur with the Council that the proposed signage is appropriately scaled and would not appear incongruous. It is also acceptably separated from residential properties which it would face. I also note that the Highways Officer does not object to the proposal subject to conditions relating to luminance levels, static imagery, the rate of change and advert failure. I agree that such 'additional' conditions are necessary in the interests of both amenity and public safety. Having regard to the guidance in PLG 05/23, the amendment to condition No 2 suggested by the appellant, requiring daytime luminance to reflect ambient light conditions and to not exceed the maximum values set out in Table 10.5 of the ILP guidance, is also necessary for the same reasons.
10. For the given reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. For the avoidance of doubt, all other 'additional' conditions imposed by the Council remain unaltered.
11. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

Paul Selby INSPECTOR