



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 July 2021

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/Z/21/3268627

Lock Lane Sports Centre, Lock Lane, Castleford WF10 2JU

- 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 UK Ltd against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02604/ADV, dated 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement of existing double-sided sign with double sided D-Poster and ancillary vertical meadow green wall
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). It replaces the previous version published in February 2019. The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied.
3. The circumstances of this appeal are such that it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework. Paragraph 132 of the replaced Framework, concerning advertisements, has been unchanged in the revised Framework and is now paragraph 136.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located to the west of Lock Lane Sports Centre that is situated on a busy road leading to the town centre. The immediate area is relatively commercialised in nature, with the sports centre, a petrol filling station and vehicle hire facility close by, although there are residential properties further afield.
6. The sports centre has an existing 'V' signboard at the entrance which would be removed to allow for the proposed advertisement to be installed.
7. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) gives an example that, in considering the effect on amenity of a proposed advertisement, a large poster-hoarding would be refused where it would dominate a group of listed buildings, but would be

permitted in an industrial or commercial area of a major city (where there are large buildings and main highways) where the advertisement would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood of the site.

8. Although the appeal site displays some characteristics of the latter context, I find that due to its size and siting, mounted on poles to give long range views, the proposed advertisement would dominate the immediate area. It would be sited prominently in the street-scene, forward of the main sports centre building and would be significantly greater in size than the unilluminated advertisement it would replace. The display of illuminated digital images would be striking and prominent and would not integrate well into the street scene. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would create an incongruous and alien feature.
9. The proposal would therefore be contrary to paragraph 136 of the Framework which states that, the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
10. In accordance with the Regulations¹, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material. I conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect upon amenity. It would therefore conflict with the amenity requirements of Policies D9 and D16 of the Wakefield Local Development Framework (2009).

Other Matters

11. The fact that the appeal site is not within a conservation area or close to any heritage assets does not override the harm I have identified.
12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the appellant. I consider that none of them including those relating to luminance, display time, content restriction and changing of images, would negate the harm that I have identified. The provision of landscaping as outlined is a minor benefit that does not override the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR

¹ Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007