
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **S Burch BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/Z/24/3355294

117 High Street West, Glossop, Derbyshire, SK13 8BB

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Farrell of Directional Sign Co. against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HPK/2024/0304.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as *'retrospective planning consent for 1 x non-illuminated advertising sign (measuring 1.8m wide x 1.2m high, and consisting of a printed advert image on a 'Foamex' display board).'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The advertisement which is the subject of this appeal is in place. Consequently, I have dealt with the appeal as involving an application for retrospective consent.

Main Issue

3. The Council have raised no objection in respect of highway safety, and I observed nothing which would lead me to dispute this conclusion. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the visual amenity of the area including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wren Nest Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached property. The advertisement is situated on its gable end facing highway users on High Street West and pedestrians who pass along the footpath immediately next to the side of the building next to a brook. The appeal site is situated within the main shopping area of Glossop and within the defined local plan town centre. It is also located within the Wren's Nest Conservation Area. The surrounding area comprises a mix of retail uses, and various signage and advertisements are evident within the area.
5. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

6. The section of High Street West, within which the appeal site is located, is characterised by retail units on the ground floor, often with signage above the shop front. As you travel further down the street, moving away from the town centre, there are rows of terraced cottages. Constructed from sandstone, the properties along High Street West appear to be of similar age and architectural design and style. The appeal site is particularly prominent when travelling out of the town centre along High Street West due to the presence of Glossop Brook which creates a visual gap between the buildings. The Glossop Conservation Area Character Appraisal makes specific mention of the appeal site, outlining how it, amongst other properties, sets the entrance to the town centre. The Council similarly outline in their case officer report how the appeal site marks the boundary to and from the historic town centre.
7. The advertisement measures 1.8 metres (m) in width by 1.2 m in height and is located adjacent to the pavement at an elevated height of 2.6m. It is non illuminated and consists of a printed advert image on a 'Foamex' display board. It is particularly prominent due to the site's positioning off Glossop Brook which, as outlined above, creates a visual gap between buildings. Its positioning also somewhat signals the transition out of the traditional town centre, and into the wider town centre area. The advertisement's prominence is also exacerbated due to its garish bright red colour which stands out against the muted background of the wall and detracts from the otherwise blank and traditional elevation.
8. Whilst I accept that there are numerous advertisements in the area, these are most often above shop fronts, particularly in the area immediately surrounding the appeal site. They are also often more modest in size than the appeal advertisement and do not occupy such a prominent position on an otherwise blank elevation.
9. The appellant argues that the advertisement screens the unsightly area of the railway viaduct. However, as the sign is attached to a wall and there is no railway viaduct that forms a backdrop to the site this is not the case.
10. An approved application at 85/87 High Street West for an illuminated sign on the wall above the shop and an illuminated hanging sign at the same property has been cited in support of the appeal. The context of the two though are quite different. The appeal site is located towards the western edge of the town centre where commercial activity is less intense, and the sign is the dominant feature on a largely blank gable end wall. In contrast, Nos 85/87 are located closer to the core of the town centre where the vast majority of buildings are in commercial use. Here, the wall sign is surrounded by similar sized windows with fascia signs and larger shop windows beneath that compete visually with the illuminated signs for attention. As a result, the signs at Nos 85/87 are acceptable, whilst the appeal sign is not.
11. For the above reasons, the advertisement is visually intrusive in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would have a harmful effect on visual amenity.
12. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are relevant. Policies EQ6 and EQ7 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new development contributes to local distinctiveness and to the character of the

building and historic environment. I have concluded that the advertisement harms amenity, and therefore the appeal proposal conflicts with these policies. For the same reason, the proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states, amongst other things, that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has made reference to a number of other matters in support of the appeal. However, when determining an application or appeal in relation to advertisement consent, only the effect of the advert on amenity and public safety are relevant considerations. Given that I have taken into account the points raised by the appellant in relation to amenity, and that safety is not at issue, the other matters referred to do not form part of the consideration of this appeal.
14. The appellant has included a list of suggested conditions which they argue would further mitigate the impact of the advertisement. I have reviewed this list of conditions but do not consider that any of them would successfully mitigate the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the advertisement harms amenity and the appeal should be dismissed.

S Burch

INSPECTOR