

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by John Braithwaite BSc(Arch) BArch(Hons) RIBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V4305/G/19/3223554

59 Kemble Street, Prescot L34 5SF

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a Discontinuance Notice relating to the use of a site for the display of advertisements with deemed consent.
 - The appeal is made by Primesight Limited against discontinuance action by Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The Council reference is 18/00156/UNADV. The Discontinuance Notice is dated 10 September 2018.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed. The Discontinuance Notice shall come back into effect immediately and the use of the site for the display of advertisements with deemed consent shall cease by the end of 21 days from the date of this decision.

Reasons

2. 59 Kemble Street is a corner property with a shop front on Kemble Street and a side elevation to Aspinall Street. The 48 sheet advertisement hoarding is attached to the side elevation and is positioned, principally, to be visible to drivers of vehicles driving west along Kemble Street.

3. The main issue is whether the use of the appeal site for the display of an advertisement panel with deemed consent is substantially detrimental to the interests of amenity.

4. The Council has referred to the completed redevelopment of the Former Lancashire Watch Factory in the town, to the development of the Shakespeare North Playhouse close to the town centre, to the Prescot Townscape Heritage Initiative (PTHI), and to the Prescot Town Centre Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The PTHI is focused on improvements to the town centre, which is at the heart of the Prescot Conservation Area. The appeal property is outside the town centre and the Conservation Area and the matters referred to by the Council do not have any bearing on the main issue.

5. Kemble Street is predominantly residential though there are scattered retail and other units such as that which occupies the ground floor of the appeal property. The shop unit is not prominent in the street scene and the advertisement panel on the side elevation does not advertise the shop. The side elevation includes windows and traditional architectural detailing around windows and at eaves level.

6. The hoarding nearly touches the sloping pavement on one side and is close to ground and first floor windows. It is cramped and, given its size, dominates the gable elevation of the traditional property. The hoarding, furthermore, is a prominent and visually obtrusive feature in far and near views along Kemble Street and, in particular, in the vicinity of the junction with Aspinall Street. The hoarding, in this regard, is immediately adjacent to the pavement on the west side of the street and dominates the road junction.

7. All matters mentioned in support of the appeal have been taken into account but do they do not, either individually or collectively, alter the conclusion that the advertisement panel is substantially detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the continued display of the advertisement with deemed consent would be substantially detrimental to the interests of amenity.

John Braithwaite

Inspector