



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by M Madge Dip TP, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/Z/20/3245041

Advertising Right, 116 Manchester Road, Altrincham WA14 4PY

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Thomas Johnston of J C Decaux UK Ltd against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 99180/ADV/19, dated 28 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is the removal of existing advertisement and the installation of an internally illuminated sequential display of similar dimension, and same height to underside.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the internally illuminated sequential display in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 99180/ADV/19, dated 28 October 2019. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans A01446/01, A01447/02, A01447/05, A01447/06 and A01447/07.
 - 2) The sequential change of the advertisement display shall not change more than once every 10 seconds and the change between advertisement images shall take place over a period no greater than one second.
 - 3) The advertisement display shall only display static images and shall not display any moving images, or apparently moving images.
 - 4) In the event of breakdown, the screen shall automatically power off to prevent flashing error messages being shown.
 - 5) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements displayed on the panel shall not exceed 300 cd/sq.m during the hours of darkness.

Main Issue

2. There is no dispute that no harm to residential amenity or public safety would occur and therefore the main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on visual amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a mixed use area. At the time of my visit the site contained an existing externally illuminated advertisement display panel of a size similar to that proposed. There is no dispute that the use of the site for the display of advertisements of this scale is established.
4. Advertisements in the locality are predominantly related to their respective businesses. The number of hoardings in the wider area may be low, but given the presence of the existing advertisement, there would be no adverse cumulative effect on visual amenity.
5. While the advertisement would be visible from several places, including a significant length of the A56, the replacement advertisement would occupy a similar position and have similar dimensions to the existing advertisement. The proposed means of illumination and construction materials would however differ.
6. The site is located within an area benefitting from street lighting and where there are several existing illuminated advertisements. While there may be few digital advertisements in the area, illumination during the hours of darkness is not uncommon and the proposed advertisement would therefore be in keeping with the existing appearance of the area. A high level of luminance could however result in the advertisement appearing intrusive during the hours of darkness, but this can be controlled by condition. Internal, digital illumination may have a different appearance but there is no substantive evidence to suggest that it would be significantly more intrusive in this location.
7. I have noted the comments of the Council in relation to the location of other proposed digital advertisements and their dismissal at appeal, but I do not have details of those schemes before me. I have therefore assessed this appeal on its own merits, having regard to this particular location and available evidence. Despite the change in means of illumination, for the reasons given, I find that the proposal would not appear significantly more visually obtrusive than the existing advertisement.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not harm visual amenity by reason of its siting, materials or means of illumination.
9. I have had regard to paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which provides similar guidance to the Regulations. I have also had regard to, so far as they are relevant, Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted January 2012 and advice set out in the Trafford Metropolitan Borough's Planning Guidelines Advertisements document approved in July 1995. These seek to ensure development is compatible with the surrounding area, does not prejudice amenity and does not adversely affect public safety. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm visual amenity, there is no policy conflict.

Conditions

10. In addition to the 5 standard conditions, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as it provides certainty. I have imposed conditions to control the frequency of image change, ensure that images remain static and to control the level of luminance as these are necessary to safeguard amenity.

The wording of these conditions has been amended from that suggested by the Council to provide certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

M Madge

INSPECTOR