



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31st October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/Z/17/3180813

Land at King William Street and Trafford Road, Salford M50 3UQ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ben Porte, Insite Poster Properties against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/70026/ADV, dated 18 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of new illuminated 48-sheet digital display measuring 6m x 3m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the junction of Broadway and Trafford Road (A5063) – a major transport route within the Greater Manchester area. It is proposed to site an advertisement display on a raised planting bed within the paved area to the north of the Oasis Academy development and its car park.
4. The area is predominately urban in character, whilst the A5063 and its associated infrastructure dominate the immediate street scene. The Planning Practice Guidance¹ states that outdoor advertisements may be acceptable where they are within an industrial or commercial area of a major city where there are large buildings and main highways. In this instance, whilst the large buildings of recent regeneration projects in Salford populate the distant skyline, land uses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are predominately residential, with housing opposite the site across both the A5063 and Broadway. It seems to me, therefore, that the appeal site and its surroundings are more akin to a residential neighbourhood in character, rather than an industrial or commercial area with large buildings.
5. I note that advertisements are, by design, intended to be prominent. However, the display would measure around 6m in width with a height of around 3m, whilst the top of the display would be around 6m from ground level. In my view, this would be a display of considerable size and would appear as a

¹ Paragraph 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306

prominent addition to the street scene. Indeed, it would reflect little of its surrounding context, as I was able to see from my site visit that this stretch of the A5063 is largely free from large scale advertisements, with one hoarding on the southbound side to the north of the appeal site and a small sign on the central reservation. A large digital display above the M601 is located a short distance to the north but this would not be seen in the predominant views of the appeal proposal when travelling southbound.

6. Moreover, whilst the Oasis Academy building would be seen behind the display, it would not form an immediate backdrop. Rather, the display would be seen as a somewhat isolated element of highway paraphernalia and would not necessarily integrate within the public realm. Indeed, the separation of around 35m from the school building would only serve to enhance its prominence. As a result, I consider the proposed display would appear as an unduly incongruous and dominant feature within the street scene.
7. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on amenity, in conflict with saved Policy DEV2 of the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan 2004-2016 (2006) which states that consent will only be granted for advertisements which would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity. It would also conflict with paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the built environment.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has suggested a number of conditions in relation to the illumination, display time and sequencing of the advertisement display. However, none of the suggested conditions would overcome the harm I have identified and, as such, are not necessary in this instance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR