



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/Z/25/3370298

Boundary wall, rear of Cains Brewery Village, Stanhope Street, Liverpool, L8 5XJ

- 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 Elonex against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25A/1164.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of a single-sided, 12m x 3m landscape LED display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the display on:
 - The visual amenity of the area around Grafton Street, Jamaica Street and Parliament Street, and
 - Highway safety along Parliament Street and Jamaica Street.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the junction of Parliament Street with Jamaica Street to the north and Grafton Street to the south. The south eastern quadrant of the junction is occupied by the Cains Brewery and associated buildings that currently make up a large entertainment venue including food and drink establishments. There are seating areas and small attached buildings running along the southern side of Parliament Street between the main buildings and the highway. The small corner building at the junction is set at an angle to the roads and is covered by a mural display advertising the Brewery Village, though it appears this may not benefit from specific Advertisement Consent. The proposed internally lit LED display would be set above this mural and would be of a similar size.
4. Policy UD9 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) indicates that proposals for advertisements will only be permitted where, amongst other things, they are of the highest standard; they do not constitute a traffic hazard; they do not detract from the character or appearance of important historic buildings; they do not become part of a critical mass of similar advertisements that lead to clutter; and the size, scale and design is appropriate for the size, scale and architectural detailing of the building.

5. Paragraph 079 of the Planning Practice Guidance Note (PPG) indicates that a large poster-hoarding might be refused where it would dominate a group of listed buildings, but might 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. Paragraph 067 of the PPG notes that all advertisements are intended to attract attention, but proposed advertisements at points where drivers need to take more care are more likely to affect public safety. Such points could include at junctions, or other places where local conditions present traffic hazards.

Visual Amenity

6. Whilst there are listed buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site, the Council acknowledges that the proposed digital display and the listed buildings are not easily read together, and that there are, therefore, no objections to the proposal from a heritage perspective. I concur with that view.
7. However, the display would be sited in a very prominent position at the junction of Parliament Street and Grafton Street, and would be set at a height above the existing mural on the angled wall at the junction, facing the traffic travelling east along the busy road. I note that the site lies within the 'Baltic Triangle', which is a collection of repurposed warehouses, some old and some new, which now comprise an area of offices, creative spaces, and Food/Beverage establishments. As such, it is a commercial area where one might expect to find advertisements of varied sizes and design, and it currently has a large number of illuminated and non-illuminated displays along the side of buildings on the southern side of Parliament Street.
8. The appellants note that the Council recently granted permission for a number of advertisements along this street frontage, including large advertisements on the side of the Boxpark building. Alongside these are what appear to be smaller and older advertisements on the building at the corner plot with Grafton Street. These displays are all set on the walls of buildings, such that they are parallel to the road and not directly facing the traffic. By way of contrast, the proposed display would be around 3 metres high, set above the existing mural, and would extend virtually the entire width of the angled façade at the junction. The large size, along with its illuminated nature and projection beyond the building line formed by the warehouses to the east, would result in a visually intrusive feature that would appear excessively dominant when viewed from the west. In addition, by reason of its large size, the rear of the proposed display would be highly prominent when approaching from the east.
9. In conclusion on this issue, there are a large number of advertisement displays along this short section of road and while one might expect such displays in a commercial area such as this, this is not reason to add further clutter. The proposed illuminated display would be set above the mural and would be seen against and across some of the advertisements on the building behind. It would also be seen in the context of the larger, more recent advertisements on the wall of the Boxpark building. To add to this existing arrangement of displays would, in my opinion, adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood of the site, which includes a large converted warehouse building across Parliament Street, and a large modern residential block across Grafton Street. These buildings have very few advertisement displays and present attractive and uncluttered façades.

10. In the light of the above, I find that the proposal would add to the critical mass of existing advertisements, and would result in clutter. As such, it would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area along Parliament Street and around its junction with Grafton Street. On this basis, it would also conflict with Policy UD9 of the LP and with guidance within Paragraph 079 of the PPG.

Highway safety

11. The proposed display would be sited in an elevated and prominent position at a busy traffic light controlled junction. By reason of its size, elevated position and illumination, It would be a highly visible feature when approaching along Parliament Street from the west, and from Jamaica Street to the north. Parliament Street is a wide road and the display would be visible over a significant distance. The appellants contend that the traffic lights at its junction with Jamaica Street would only be directly in front of the display for a short distance before the junction. I acknowledge this point, but there is also a split into a right turn lane at the junction, and although the lights would not appear within the spread of the display, the scale and illumination could be a distraction within the general sight-lines of drivers manoeuvring along the road.
12. More significantly, for traffic travelling south along Jamaica Street, the lights would be in line with the mural and the display above it for some distance before the junction, and would be directly in the sight-line of drivers. In my opinion, the proposed display would be a major distraction and form a hazard to road-users at this busy junction.
13. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the proposed display would be a distracting feature to drivers travelling south on Jamaica Street and, to a lesser extent, those travelling east on Parliament Street. On this basis, it would be harmful to highway safety around the junction of Parliament Street and Jamaica Street, and would conflict with Policy UD9 of the LP and with guidance in paragraph 067 of the PPG.

Conclusion

14. On the main issues, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area along Parliament Street and around its junction with Grafton Street, and that it would be harmful to highway safety around the junction of Parliament Street and Jamaica Street. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR