

ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP CONSULTATION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Forty-two responses to the consultation were received overall (40% response); **thirty-one were from local councils and other administrative bodies in East Sussex**. These are available in the Members' room. A summary of responses is set out in the table below and the findings are as follows:

- ❖ Around two-thirds of the local respondents (19 of 31) were in favour of roadside sponsorship. (Q1.)
- ❖ Most of those who were not in favour cited the proliferation of signs, particularly in areas of special conservation or landscape value as their main objection.
- ❖ Virtually everyone agreed that a safety audit was an important first assessment approach; several felt that aesthetics was an important first consideration as well. (Q2.)
- ❖ Only a minority of local councils, (6), agreed that they would be prepared to carry £10 million public liability (PL) insurance. These were mostly the larger town councils.(Q3.)
- ❖ Virtually everyone said that the cost of PL insurance should be covered by the sponsor.
- ❖ Several suggested other ideas for sponsorship. These included litter bins planters, seats, laybys and, interestingly, gateway features including town/village name signs. (Q4.)
- ❖ Of the idea of sponsoring signs and other street furniture most felt that, if it was to be allowed, the main issues were that it was site-dependant; sponsorship details should not be placed on *information* signs, it should not be a distraction to road users, and would not be applicable in conservation areas. (Q5.)
- ❖ Nearly all respondents felt that the number of signs, size and wording should be strictly controlled. (Q6.)
- ❖ Most respondents agreed that sponsorship sign wording should normally be limited to the company's name and a logo. If it was not obvious what the nature of the company was, this could be included. A few supported the idea of partnership wording being included. Contact details were not supported.(Q7.)
- ❖ Most of the respondents said that sponsorship sign size should be limited. Around half of the respondents (18 of 31) agreed that the proposed 800mm x 250mm size was acceptable. (Q8.)
- ❖ About half the local respondents (13 of 31) did not agree that larger signs should be allowed. However, a few (6) said that this depended on the site location – suggestions were that this should be subject to planning approval (at the applicant's expense). (Q9 and 10.)
- ❖ Over half the local respondents (18 of 31) felt that planning permission should be sought in all cases. (Q11.)
- ❖ A few (4) suggested that planning permission should be sought where there were special circumstances or departures from the 'norm'. Eastbourne Borough Council said that planning permission is sought where 'structures', such as planters or landscaping were proposed as opposed to just planting.
- ❖ A third of local respondents (10 of 31) said that any surplus income should be shared with the local council; a few (5) said that all the surplus should go to the local council. Several said that the surplus should go to whichever authority did most of the setting-up arrangements. (Q12.)

- ❖ Of those who made a comment about what any surplus should be spent on (7), all said it should go towards improving the highway environment (visibly better).
- ❖ Most of those who responded on this question (24 of 31) said that sponsorship periods should be flexible; two to five years was reasonable with three being about the norm. (Q13)
- ❖ The majority of respondents (20) felt that situations where sponsorship would not be appropriate included historic and conservation areas; busy junctions and light-controlled crossings/junctions; accident sites and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). (Q14.)
- ❖ In terms of how to deal with requests, most local respondents (18) felt that the normal consultation processes between Area highway offices and local councils were an important feature in determining the appropriateness of sponsorship schemes. A few (4) suggested that the formal planning process was appropriate. One suggested that a Code of Practice be drawn up. (Q15.)

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?			Normal planning procedures	PCs should be consulted.	Close liaison between planning & highways
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?			AONBs, National Parks, Sensitive	No new sites	Aesthetics very important.
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?			Yes. PC to decide.	N/A	Flexible, but 3 years minimum.
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?			All to PC	Small advantage to local councils	Income should go to body that sets up the deal and
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?			Years – all	N/A	Only for 'hard' physical features
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?			N/A	N/A	Should not be reflective
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	Minimal signage		No	N/A	Does not support council logo etc
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Minimal signage		Yes	N/A	800mm x 250mm is best
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?			Yes – restricted.	N/A	Name and logo, possibly location
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE, AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	Minimal signage		N/A	N/A	Sponsorship signing should not
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?			No	No	Possibly, depends on site
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?			No	None	Hanging baskets, seating, tress etc, roadside
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?			No	No	EBC bears cost; difficult for smaller councils
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?			Yes	As 1.	Important, as appropriate
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	In principle, yes, but no signs	No benefit to parish	No	No more than at present	Yes
	CHIDDINGLY PARISH COUNCIL	CROWHURST PARISH COUNCIL	DITCHLING PARISH COUNCIL	EAST CHILTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	EASTBOURNE BOROUGH COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Need Code of Practice		Planning authority	Yes	
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	Accident sites		AONBs and conservation areas		
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	Yes (2-5 years flexible)		Subject to planning	Yes – flexible	N/A
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	No				Not a source of income
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good idea	Yes, planning permission
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?	As small as possible to be read.		No – too many signs	Size of site – impact.	N/A
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	No	No	No – too many signs	Yes – depends on site	No
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Yes	Minimal signage	Minimal	Yes - Depends on site	Minimum size
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	Extra only if relevant		Minimal		N/A
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	Yes	Minimal signage	Minimal	Yes	N/A
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?	No		Subject to no distraction to drivers	Yes	No
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	None		Traffic calming features		No
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	ESCC should bear, or sponsor		Unlikely – sponsor should pay.	No – sponsor should pay	No
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Yes		Not initially, but important	Yes	
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	No merit	In principle, yes, but no signs	Not acceptable in AONB	Yes	No more than present
	EWHURST PARISH COUNCIL	FOREST ROW PARISH COUNCIL	FRANT PARISH COUNCIL	HADLOW DOWN PARISH COUNCIL	HARTFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Normal process	Local planning and marketing		Local consultation. HA approve before
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	Where a distraction	AONBs and conservation areas	AONBs, Memorials	Health and safety paramount. Designate
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	2 – 5 years (flexible)	Flexible	3 years is norm.	Flexible – possibly longer
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	Payable to local town/parish council		Up to Council	Surplus should be reinvested in streetscene
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	Yes	Early consultation with planning	Kent & Berks do.	Yes – sought by sponsor
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?		Subject to discussion with planners	Kent & Berks use 3,000 sqmm	Need an upper limit
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	No	Subject to discussion with planners	Herts allow 5,000 sqmm	Depends on location
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Yes	Size of sign affects income.	1000mm x300mm used in Berks.	A limit is necessary
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	Yes	As appropriate to the site	Name & logo + other if necessary	Agree partnership wording
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?		Controlled for safety. Use an	800x250 too small for boundary	Yes
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?	No	Yes, but not in a conservation area	Boundary signs	Possibilities
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	No	Boundary signs	'Walking bus' for schools	Street lights, bridges, parking permits etc
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	Yes, but ESCC should remain		Difficult for sponsors	£5m to £10m needed
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Yes	Part of process	Yes, particularly where	Agree
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	In principle, yes, but minimum	Yes	Yes	Support
HEATHFIELD & WALDRON PARISH COUNCIL		IMMEDIATE SOLUTIONS	KEEGAN FORD SPONSORSHIP	KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Yes	Yes: LTC planning committee	Use commonsense		Formal notice between councils
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	Covered by consultation	Yes – out of keeping with an area	Conservation areas		Controlled junctions
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	Flexible	Minimum of 2/3 years	Yes, flexible		Flexible
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	Share between HA and local council	Yes on Better tendered verges	Share, ESCC and local council for local highway imp	50/50 share	Town Council should keep income.
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	Planning permission sought by sponsor	Yes	No – just highways.	No	Planning permission
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?			Depends on location and highway view	No – safety	Depends on location
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	No	No	Yes 1000mm x 500mm	No – safety	No
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	Limited to name only	Yes and logo	Nature of business	Depends on lettering	More where necessary
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?	Yes	Town crests and Local societies	Unwelcome in historic areas; OK in others	Yes	Yes
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	Safety for vulnerable users; traffic calming.	Planters	None identified	Don't know	Litter bins and bus shelters
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	Too expensive	Yes	Should be borne by sponsor	Yes	No
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Agree	HA to decide	Yes	Yes	Yes
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	Yes	Yes	Modest increase	Flexible	Yes
	KINGSTON PARSISH COUNCIL	LEWES TOWN COUNCIL	MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL	ICKLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL	PEACEHAVEN TOWN COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Yes with local councils	Subject to planning	Yes		Yes, normal process.
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	At busy or dangerous junctions	Subject to planning	Safety on major roads		Safet areas, conservation areas
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	Flexible	As appropriate	Agree		Yes (2 -5 years)
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	Share with local councils	On roundabout improvement t	Shared		Shared with town/parish
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	Appropriate for larger sites.	Planning authority to determine	On balance, yes.		Yes.
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?	No increase in height.	Planning authority to determine	Traffic, safety & planning		N/A
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	Only to allow partnership details	Planning authority to determine			No
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Minimal – 800x250 acceptable	Planning authority to determine	Yes		Yes
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	Restricted, but logo or partnership OK	Yes – explanation where appropriate	Yes, initially		Yes, restricted
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE, AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	Yes	Subject to planning permission	Yes		N/A
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?	Yes	Not on information signs.	Yes		No
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	Gateways, laybys	Only roundabouts	No		
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	No – should be ESCC	HA should insure	No – sponsor		No – sponsor to pay
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Yes	Planning authority	Agree		Yes
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No more than present
	PEVENSEY PARISH COUNCIL	PIDDINGHOE PARISH COUNCIL	POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL	RYE TOWN COUNCIL	SALESHURST & ROBERTSBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Yes with local towns and parishes	Local offices and districts		Set as part of policy	Yes
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	In rural areas and near road signs	Should not increase "clutter"	Concern in AONB	AONBs or where distraction is a danger	AONBs, Conservation area, traffic
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	Flexible	Flexible		Fixed periods	Yes – flexible
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	Income should go to road maintenance	Flexible – reinvest in highway environment		No comment	All to TC
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	Yes	Depends on LPAs		No comment	Subject to planning Regs.
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?		Planning authority and HA		Policy should set maximum size.	Dependant on site
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	Possibly to cover an eyecore	Allow larger (1000mm x 500mm) with		May need planning permission	No
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?		600mm x 300mm		Agree	Yes
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	Minimal wording	Yes		Minimum necessary. No contact details	No – would accept logo, partnership
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	Yes – strictly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?	No	Possibly signing		Gateways, but not near speed signs	Litter bins, bollards, railings and seats
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	Floral planting in towns	Looking at housing estate amenity areas		Possibly, depends on location	Yes
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	No – private sector to pay	Sponsor should pay.		No comment	No
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Safety and landscape impact	Yes		Yes, through Area office	Yes
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	No	Support, but limited	Caution	No objection	Yes
	ST JOHN WITHOUT PARISH COUNCIL	SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL	SUSSEX DOWNS CONSERVATION BOARD	SUSSEX POLICE	TELSCOMBE TOWN COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Yes	Yes.	Area Committees	Normal consultation
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	Controlled crossings	Depends on site.	AONBs, Conservation areas.	Depends on location and merit
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	2 to 5 years	3 to 5 years	Through Area Committees	Yes, flexible (2 – 5 years)
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	50/50 Copunity/Local council	Cover costs then share between TC and Broker.	Depends on local arrangements	Distribution should reflect who puts in the work.
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	See 8.	Can this be 'packaged'	Where amenity and aesthetics are an issue	Only if needed
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?	See 8.	Depends on site.	Subject to planning permission	Depends on site.
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	See 8.	1000mm x 500mm. PP for larger.	Subject to planning permission	Partnership wording OK
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Anything over should be subject to planning.	No. Larger size favoured.	Subject to planning permission	Depends on site.
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	Generally, but logo etc if not readily available	Logos and partnerships should be allowed	Only if not clear from name alone	Nature of business acceptable
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	Yes	Yes	Subject to planning permission	Yes
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?		Shouldn't be on direction signs.	Yes, subject to planning permission	Yes
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	Street name plates (Districts)	Seats, bins, laybys, planters..	Being reviewed	Parish noticeboards, ROW signs
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	£10m cover needed – could be via local councils	Yes, but cover could be part of fee.	Take a risk-assessed approach	ESCC's responsibility
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Yes, in first instance.	Yes. Covered in fee.	Safety checklist	Reasonable
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	Yes	Support	Support	OK in principle
	T&E SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	UCKFIELD TOWN COUNCIL	WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	WESTMESTON PARISH COUNCIL

15. CAN NORMAL DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTATION BETWEEN COUNCILS DEAL WITH THIS?	Planning permission
14. ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SPONSORSHIP NOT APPROPRIATE?	Not in rural areas or B & C roads.
13. HOW LONG SHOULD SPONSORSHIP DEALS BE FOR?	Planning permission
12. HOW SHOULD ANY SURPLUS INCOME BE SHARED?	
11. SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE A REQUIREMENT?	Planning permission
10. WHAT SHOULD GOVERN SIGN SIZE?	
9. SHOULD LARGER SIGNS BE ALLOWED?	
8. SHOULD SIGN SIZE BE AT THE MINIMUM 800mmX1200mm?	Absolute minimum
7. SHOULD WORDING BE LIMITED TO COMPANY NAME?	
6. SHOULD NUMBER OF SIGNS, SIZE, AND WORDING BE STRICTLY CONTROLLED?	
5. SHOULD SPONSORSHIP OF OTHER STREET FURNITURE, (E.G. SIGNS), BE ALLOWED?	None in rural areas
4. ANY OTHER IDEAS FOR ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP?	
3. ARE LOCAL COUNCILS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE £10 MILLION PUBLIC LIABILITY INSURANCE?	No for small councils
2. IS SAFETY AUDIT THE BEST INITIAL CONSIDERATION?	Planning permission
1. DO YOU SUPPORT ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP/	No more than present
	WHATLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

APPENDIX B

ROADSIDE SPONSORSHIP	PS8/6
<u>Purpose of Policy</u> To permit planting, landscaping and sponsorship of roadside features with appropriate recognition of sponsors.	
<u>Specific Policies</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Director of Transport & Environment is authorised to agree planting, landscaping and installation of other features on the highway through sponsorship with appropriate notices, may set appropriate conditions and negotiate the distribution of any net surplus income.2. Any applicant or sponsor seeking permission to carry out planting, landscaping or installation of other features on the highway will need to enter into an agreement satisfying, among other things, the following:-<ol style="list-style-type: none">(a) Provision of a plan of the proposal of 1/500 scale or greater(b) Details of any notices the applicant wishes to be displayed.(c) An undertaking covering a maintenance period, of up to five years or financial reimbursement in the event of failure to fulfil the conditions;(d) Indemnification of the County Council against any claims relating to the proposals.3. Applications shall be in accordance with the Code of Practice for roadside sponsorship taking into account the following factors; road safety, maintenance of the feature, future highway Works, the appropriateness of the proposals within the local environment, layout and number of sponsorship notices (normal notice size not to exceed 0.2 square metres), and any other relevant matters.4. The procedure for considering applications shall provide for taking into account the views of the local member and the Town or Parish Council.5. Proposals which include hard landscaping or other physical features, or fall outside the requirements of the Code of Practice will be subject to the additional requirement for the applicant to seek planning permission.6. Proposals will need to satisfy current legislation concerning Public Utilities' apparatus and may require the applicant to submit additional drawings and details.7. The sponsor will be required to meet all the costs of the authorities in considering the application, all future maintenance and insurance.8. The distribution of any surplus income will be subject to negotiation with the county council.	
<u>Supporting Statement</u> Roadside sponsorship has been regulated by the provisions of the Highways Act 1980. This policy is designed to allow sponsoring organisations to improve the aesthetic appearance of the highway	
References - Further Information H&T Committee 16 September 1992 – Agenda item 9.1 Transport & Environment Committee 30 September 1997 Cabinet Committee 19 April 2005	<u>Date of Approval</u>