

**Planning & Advertising Consent - [CAAC submission](#) response:**

CAAC Comments	AP Response
<p>3. notice boards, we recognise the need to replace - reservations about: the four-sided and two-sided monoliths, with their down-to-the-ground form they would be vulnerable to damage and in the case of the four-sided design might be used as receptacles for rubbish. (also how the information is displayed see 5 below)</p>	<p>We have requested that mesh be incorporated into the design to prevent this.</p>
<p>4. Object to the no of proposed lamppost banners. Excessive if all to be used at the same time and seem to serve no real purpose beyond reminding visitors of where they have already chosen to visit. We have concerns about their information design, again these are explained below.</p>	<p>The lampposts are quite old and we are undertaking a tolerance survey to establish which lampposts would pass the requirements for banners to be attached.</p> <p>At the time of design &amp; application we were not in a position to undertake this work and were unable to stipulate exactly which ones or how many would be used we sought consent for all, however, it is unlikely that all 63 lampposts would pass the test. We would suggest a maximum percentage of 60% of the AP Way lampposts to be used at any one time. We will seek specific feedback from CAAC as to any they have identified will be problematic re trees and sightlines in order to avoid this occurring.</p> <p>Regarding the artwork, these are mock-ups we will produce a design brief as our next step aimed at achieving an appropriate balance of our heritage stories and current activities. This will protect against the banners being solely commercial narrative. We are amenable to liaising with the CAAC and the Friends of the Park on the design brief.</p>
<p>5. In design terms we have concerns about aspects of the content and style of the information as shown in the proposed examples. Although we have some differences of view about this, the majority view is to object to what can be seen as advertising spin with no real content and serving no real purpose. Similarly, we have different views on the choice of "Palace Display" for the font (which can be seen as dumbing down), and we are concerned that the light strokes in some letters make them difficult to read. These differences of view are the subject of further comment in the summary below.</p>	<p>The samples in the planning application documents are mock-ups and do not represent what will be shown all the time.</p> <p>There will be a balance between the charitable information and advertising the commercial events. The boards will be an opportunity to tell the heritage story effectively and can be changed regularly. Our Curatorial and interpretation manager is working on a programme of content.</p>
<p>6. Additional concerns are that at 2.4 metres in height many of the proposed banners would be partially obscured by tree cover, that they might obscure bus-stops and compromise the highly valued views of London from the Terrace.</p>	<p>The lamppost banners come in different sizes. 2.4m was recommended based on the height of AP's lampposts. We were not concerned about this but clearly the CAAC have noticed that the banners or views or bus stop might be obscured and we welcome any feedback about specific locations.</p>
<p>We understand the need for new and better signage, but we do not think these proposals are appropriate. We would like to see better and bolder informative notices at each of the entrances to indicate that visitors are entering a park and space of special interest and not just any-old-park.</p>	<p>We would love to see greater acknowledgement at entrances that you are entering a special site, but this is beyond the budget available. The previous arches were removed in the early 2000's. We don't have a full understanding of the rationale for their removal.</p>
<p>... the majority are opposed to the use of what can be seen as empty slogans (e.g., "Forever Yours") presented in a facile way (e.g., "Palace Display"). To the extent that the CAAC membership can be seen as a focus group sample of target visitors to APP, it is perhaps significant that the majority are critical of the approach currently adopted.</p>	<p>These were mock-ups. We have now worked on these more and have revised the phrasing. However we do not feel that CAAC is representative of the very diverse visitor base we currently have and have a duty to ensure we achieve. Our communications approach will be to appeal to a diverse and broad audience base.</p>
<p>Many visitors are attracted to the Park for its greenspace providing escape from cars, urban London and advertising, with the aim of 'relaxation, both physical and mental', consistent with AP's mission statement. These proposals work against it.</p>	<p>The park has many different uses and users all of whom define relaxation and enjoyment in different ways. We are careful to keep areas of the parkland for quiet enjoyment. These proposals align with that approach by concentrating the larger signs and messaging where there will be large volumes of people. The signs and banners are of a suitable scale for this and for these surroundings close to a road and large building. In other areas of the park smaller scale notice boards have been chosen.</p>