
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/Z/19/3229694

8 Shaw Road, Oldham OL1 3LQ

- 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 Mr Jackson (UK Resin Drives Ltd) against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AD/342961/19, dated 7 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'commercial property business branding'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed advertisement in the banner heading above is taken from the original application for advertisement consent. The Council's decision notice provided a more detailed description, '1 no. non-illuminated wraparound fascia sign and 1 no. part non-illuminated and part internally illuminated wraparound second floor building sign'.
3. The advertisement described is already largely in place. The appellant is seeking permission to retain the lower sign which sits between the ground floor and first floor windows, and to enlarge the upper sign which sits above the first floor windows and conceals the building's roof line.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey, brick built commercial building which, whilst not large in itself, occupies a prominent location at the junction of Shaw Road and Huddersfield Road and is a significant feature of the street scene. The surrounding area is largely commercial in nature, with a variety of business premises of different sizes, ages and styles.
6. The lower sign occupies almost the full space between the ground floor and first floor window openings, and extends across the whole width of the Shaw Road elevation and a little less than halfway along the main Huddersfield Road elevation. The upper sign as installed runs around three sides of the building

and features three larger panels, one of which includes an LED panel clock and temperature display. The appellant wishes to extend the upper sign so that it is the same height all round as the larger panels.

7. Both signs are already extremely large in relation to the scale of the building, which as a result is somewhat overwhelmed by the signage. The signage is prominent in the street scene, and the overall impression is of a building which is dominated by advertisements. The height of the upper signage also gives the building a top-heavy appearance, and this would be exacerbated by extending it even further.
8. I accept that there was a need to replace the previous occupiers' signs when the appellant company took over the building, although from the information in front of me it seems that the previous signs were of a somewhat smaller scale. The appellant contends that the signage helps to disguise an unsightly overhanging roof. However, given the fact that the appeal was submitted retrospectively, the roof of the building was hidden from view at the time of my site visit such that I could not assess its visual impact. Accordingly, it is difficult to attach any significant weight to the suggested benefit in that regard. From the photographs presented by the appellant there was nothing particularly unusual or harmful about the roof in the context of a commercial area, and I am not satisfied that those arguments amount to a justification for the disproportionately large advertisements that have been installed. Even given the wide variety of advertisements in the surrounding area, the signage in this case stands out as large and dominant.
9. I conclude that the proposed and installed advertisement would be harmful to the appearance of the host building, and the visual amenity of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policy 9 of the 2011 Oldham Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document, which seeks to ensure that development does not have a significant adverse impact on visual amenity, and so is material to this case.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector