



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/Z/22/3300212

82 Liverpool Road, Cadishead, Manchester M44 5AN

- 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 Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/79309/ADV, dated 15 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is a single illuminated 48-sheet digital poster display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the side gable wall of No 82 Liverpool Road, a building previously in commercial use but which has recently been converted to residential units¹. It currently hosts a non-illuminated 48-sheet poster advertisement measuring 6m in width and 3 metres in height, which has been in place for more than ten years; the Council accepts that "the principle of a billboard type sign at the site is therefore established". The appellant proposes replacing the existing advertisement with an internally-illuminated digital display of equivalent size, which would display static images changing once every ten seconds.
4. The site is within the Cadishead neighbourhood centre, which comprises a range of residential and commercial properties along Liverpool Road, a busy B-road. From what I saw on my site visit, the neighbourhood centre offers a limited range of shops and services, and it appeared that many other former shop units as well as No 82 itself have been converted to residential use in recent years (with varying degrees of skill and success). There are a few larger commercial premises, but the centre is essentially modest and domestic in scale. Most of the shops and businesses within the area have a limited amount of signage, predominantly fascia and projecting signs; two garages nearby

¹ Prior approval, LPA Ref: 20/75159/P3NPA – this had not been implemented at the time the Council determined the application or when this appeal was lodged, but it appeared to have been substantially completed by the time of my site visit.

- (including Automech very close to the appeal site) have tall freestanding signs, but these limited cases do not give the area a heavily commercial character or appearance.
5. There is another poster hoarding close by (at the junction of Brinell Drive and Liverpool Road) which has external illumination, although at the time of my (daylight) site visit this was not switched on. By contrast, the proposed digital display would need to emit light continuously to produce an image, giving it a very bright appearance. It would be illuminated for 18 hours a day, making it a prominent part of the street scene. It would therefore be much brighter, and much more visually intrusive, than both the existing poster it would replace and other advertisements in the area. This would be particularly apparent in low light conditions such as during overcast days or at dawn and dusk. Overall, it would appear as a dominant and disruptive addition to the host building and streetscene.
 6. The appeal site is immediately adjacent to a residential building between No 82 and the Automech garage. The numbering of this property was not clear at the time of my site visit, although it appears from the appellant's statement that it is known as 82B (and for convenience I shall refer to it as such hereafter). The Council's officer report referred to the grant of planning permission for a change of use of 82B from storage and distribution to a residential building comprising two one-bed studio apartments and one two-bed apartment². Perhaps because the apartments had not been completed at the time the Council determined the application, it did not appear to address the potential impact of the digital advertisement on the residential amenity of those units.
 7. By the time of my site visit, those new apartments appeared to be substantially complete and occupied. The existing advertisement looms over the front forecourt of 82B, and is only a short distance from the windows on its front elevation. While, as the appellant has pointed out, the digital display would be seen at an oblique angle from within 82B, the very close proximity between it and the neighbouring apartments means that the internal illumination would make it an intrusive and disturbing feature. I therefore find that it would cause significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of the apartments at 82B, and this would be to an extent that could not be adequately mitigated by the appellant's suggestion that conditions should be imposed limiting the luminance of the display (in line with the standards set out by the Institute of Lighting Professionals) or requiring it to be switched off between 23.00 and 05.00 the following morning.
 8. Because of the siting of the proposed advertisement, it would be unlikely to be seen from within the residential units which have recently been created within No 82 itself, or other dwellings on Liverpool Road south of the appeal site. I saw that the nearest residential properties on the east side of Liverpool Road north of the appeal site are some 60m or so away, a distance such that the proposed advertisement would be unlikely to be disruptive for residents. However, this does not outweigh the other harm to residential amenity which I have described.
 9. I find that the proposed digital display advertisement would be visually intrusive and harmful to the appearance of the area, and would cause significant harm to living conditions for the occupiers of the neighbouring

² LPA Ref: 20/74745/FUL

apartments at 82A Liverpool Road. I therefore conclude that it would be harmful to amenity.

10. In accordance with the Regulations I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material, although they have not by themselves been decisive. The proposal conflicts with Policy DEV2 of the 2006 City of Salford Unitary Development Plan, which among other things seeks to ensure that advertisements do not have an unacceptable impact on amenity.

Other Matter

11. The Council considered that the proposed display would not have any harmful effect on highway safety, or public safety more generally. Nothing I saw on my site visit leads me to take a different view on this matter. However, this does not outweigh or negate the harm to amenity which I have found.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector