



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/20/3256743

Land and Buildings on the East Side of Waterloo Road, Cheetham, Manchester M8 8AE

- 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 Clear Channel against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 126725/AOH/2020, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2020.
 - The advertisements proposed are described as the removal of 4no. externally illuminated billboards and the erection of 2no. 48 sheet freestanding digital adverts.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for removal of 4no. externally illuminated billboards and erection of 2no. 48-sheet freestanding digital advertisements, as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the additional conditions set out below:
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertising displays shall be no greater than 200 candela/m².
 - 2) The advertising displays shall contain no moving images, animation, video or full motion images.
 - 3) The minimum display time for any advertisement shall be 10 seconds and the change between advertisements shall be instantaneous with no visual effect between each advertisement.

Main Issue

2. The Regulations make clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council raises no objection on safety grounds, and I have no reason to take a different view. Thus, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on amenity.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to replace four existing billboards with two digital advertisements, which will display static images on rotation without any effects between changes. In response to the Council's concerns, the appellant has proposed a reduction in luminance to 200cd/m².
4. The evidence suggests that the existing illuminated billboards on the east side of Waterloo Road are a long-established and accepted part of the built

environment. Each of the proposed digital displays would be of the same size and mounted in the same position as two of the existing billboards.

5. The splayed siting is such that for the most part only one advertisement would be visible at a time to the oncoming traffic, and would be framed against the busy commercial character of development on the east side of the road. In addition, the road is wide and well-lit at this point. In this context, the proposed advertisements would not be unduly obtrusive, incongruous or overdominant features. Moreover, given that the number of billboards would be reduced from four to two, the proposals would not contribute to visual clutter.
6. Although the advertisements would be visible to neighbours on the opposite side of Waterloo Road, the reduction in the number of adverts would be beneficial. Moreover, whilst the illumination would be more consistent across the proposed displays and more vibrant in colour, the measures proposed by the appellant in terms of luminance levels and the timing and method of operation would be sufficient to ensure that there is no harm to the living conditions of nearby residents.
7. The Council has drawn my attention to policies of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy 2012 and the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 which it considers to be relevant to this appeal. Whilst not decisive, I have had regard to these policies as material considerations.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed advertisements would not cause undue harm to amenity. Subject to the imposition of conditions to control illumination, moving images and the frequency with which the displays change, in the interests of visual amenity and public safety, a grant of express consent is justified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR