



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/Z/21/3279506

Land Adjacent to Manchester Road, Altrincham WA14 5PW

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by ARM Capital against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 103993/ADV/21, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is Advertisement consent sought for a double sided internally illuminated LED advertisement hoarding to replace existing non-illuminated double sided sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The address differs between the application form and the decision notice, including the postcode. I have taken the address from the decision notice as the postcode is correct. I note that the appellant has used the same address on the appeal form. I am therefore satisfied that the site can be identified accurately and neither party is prejudiced by this action.
3. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice as it describes the works far more accurately than the application form. I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this action.
4. The Council have referenced a policy within the Trafford Core Strategy. I have taken this into account where relevant, but the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) clearly states that issues to be addressed should only include amenity and public safety, which is reiterated by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG).
5. The Council have opposed the application on the grounds of amenity only and consider that the proposal would not detract from public safety. I have no reason to question that assessment and will not deal with the public safety issue any further in my report.

Main Issue

6. Based on the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is located within the boundary of Trafford College, between the main building and the highway, the A56 Manchester Road, which is a well trafficked route between Altrincham and Manchester. The college building is a three-storey flat roofed structure. The surrounding area is mixed in nature, between commercial and residential uses.
8. The advertisement proposed would be 6m x 3m, double sided, mounted on an approximately 2.5m high pole, and be internally illuminated, with static imagery changing instantly.
9. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) gives an example that, in considering the effect on amenity of a proposed advertisement, a large poster-boarding 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.
10. Although it is in the latter context which I find the appeal proposal, I find that its size and siting, mounted on a pole that would lead to it being a dominant and obtrusive feature. Although located within a busy commercial area, because of the siting and its scale, I find that the display would be an overbearing visual feature in the pedestrian environment. While it would not have a direct impact on any building, due to its scale, the display would be unduly imposing in the street scene
11. It would occupy a prominent position and is sufficiently removed from the nearest buildings, and as a result, due to its size, would appear isolated and incongruous. 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 alien feature.
12. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that, the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion

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

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR