



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/Z/21/3271826

92 Wood Street, Castleford WF10 1LP

- 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 Richard Page of Wildstone against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02277/ADV, dated 21 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Conversion of existing 48-sheet advertising display to a digital 48-sheet advertising display. Illumination: Display will adapt to ambient conditions - Daylight Max 5000cd/sqm, Night Max 300cd/sqm".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the southern elevation of a 2 storey building that appears to be in use as a bakery at ground floor level. The area in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site is a mix of residential and commercial properties. Nearby commercial uses include a shop, car sales and repair, a public house, a dance studio and a hot food takeaway. There are light industrial uses to the north and west. An open landscaped area is adjacent to the appeal site to the south. There is an existing non-illuminated advertisement display on the southern elevation of the host building that both the Council and appellant identify as benefiting from deemed consent. There is some signage associated with the commercial uses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
4. The gable end of the host building is visually exposed within the street scene given its positioning, orientation and the open setting created by the adjacent landscaped area to the south. Due to its size and location on the gable end of the building, the existing advertisement board is visually prominent, being visible from quite an extensive distance when travelling north west along Wood Street. The size and positioning of the proposed advertisement board would be similar to the existing display. However, this size and positioning, when combined with the illuminated display and the format of displaying advertisements with changing images, would exacerbate the impact on the street scene. The proposed advertisement board would therefore appear more visually obtrusive than the existing board.

5. At the location of the appeal site, commercial buildings and associated signage are apparent. However, the proposed advertisement board would be seen more with its residential surroundings than the commercial uses in the area and would be in marked contrast to the more subdued appearance of the nearby terraced dwellings. It would also be in marked contrast to the generally smaller and more discreet advertisement displays in the vicinity which are mainly fascia mounted signage and flagpole signage associated with the car sales premises.
6. The appellant has stated that the content would be illuminated in accordance with the best practice guidance published by the Institute of Lighting Professionals and therefore limited to 300cd/sqm at night. The appellant has also stated that the signage would contain internal sensors which allow the screen to adapt to real time ambient conditions and the advertisements would change no more frequently than once every 10 seconds. However, notwithstanding that the night time illumination would be in accordance with best practice guidance and even taking into account these mitigation measures, the size, location and digital illuminated changeable display proposed mean that the proposed advertisement board would appear as an unduly prominent and highly discordant feature in the street scene. Consequently, whilst the appeal site is not within or located close to any heritage assets, the proposed advertisement board would be significantly harmful to the visual amenity of the area.
7. A further concern about precedence is raised by the Council in its Officer Report. However, each application and appeal must be considered on its own merits.
8. I have taken into account Policies D9 and D16 of the City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Local Development Framework Development Policies Document 2009 which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposed advertisement would significantly harm amenity, it would conflict with these Policies. It would also conflict with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has identified a number of benefits of the proposed advertisement including the display of non-commercial campaigns and emergency information, a reduction in vehicle trips and waste, an upgrade of sites lacking in investment and opportunities to create locally relevant advertising and integrate additional hardware to meet smart city objectives. Whilst these benefits may arise from the proposed advertisement, relevant considerations under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 are confined to issues of amenity and public safety.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR