
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/Z/25/3374752

1 Rose Street, (east facing wall), Sunderland SR4 6AB

- 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 Capital & County Advertising Limited against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01473/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1x internally illuminated, wall mounted digital 48 sheet display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the installation of 1x internally illuminated, wall mounted digital 48 sheet display. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than within that recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals in its Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (or its equivalent in a replacement Guide).
 - 2) The internally illuminated display hereby approved shall include static images only. The interval between successive images shall be 0.1 seconds or less and the complete screen shall change. There shall be no visual effects between successive images, and the display shall include a mechanism to freeze or turn off the screen in the event of a malfunction. Each image shall be displayed for at least 10 seconds. Message sequencing or interactive messages shall not be used.

Preliminary Matters

2. The location of the site has been taken from the appeal form as this accurately describes the location of the site.
3. The description of development in the above banner heading has been taken from the Council's decision notice as this concisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

4. Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of visual amenity and public safety. The assessment regarding public safety is not disputed and the main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the east facing wall at 1 Rose Street, Millfield, Sunderland which is an end of terrace wall that faces the busy A1231 Trimdon Street. The existing property is residential and there are a mixture of residential and commercial uses nearby including Trimdon Street Retail Park to the east beyond a highly trafficked road and Hylton Road High Street to the south. The area therefore has a mixed character and there are many other advertisements, street furniture and signage in the vicinity of the site including existing commercial signage to nearby establishments.
6. The proposed development seeks to install 1x internally illuminated, wall mounted digital 48 sheet display. I understand that a 48-sheet poster panel has historically been associated with the site, and I have had due regard to the images provided showing its overall size and appearance. Although this advert has now been removed and thus is not determinative, advertisement would be a familiar feature in this locality, and its overall size, scale and positioning on the wall is also consistent with its historical display and some of the other advertisements in the surrounding area. These advertisements vary somewhat in size and format including some of an illuminated nature but are clearly visible when travelling along the nearby roads and form part of the established character of the area.
7. Having regard to the character of the locality, including the presence of various advertising displays, and existing commercial signage to nearby establishments, the proposed advertisement display would not appear out of keeping in this setting and would largely replicate the historical situation in an area that is clearly an established location for advertisements and signs.
8. The proposed advertisement would be internally illuminated. However, it would be no larger than the historical display and its size would be consistent with those in the vicinity. It would not be overly dominant in a street scene where a variety of displays are commonplace. It would not therefore unduly stand out from the existing street scene nor impact the visual amenity of the area. Furthermore, the maximum brightness will always be within the guidelines as set by the institute of Lighting Professionals Technical Note 5. Appropriate conditions could control brightness, animation and the timing of image changes. The advertisement would not therefore be deemed significantly bright or flashing as to result in a detrimental harm to visual amenity particularly when taking into account the existing character of the area. The area is also one which is well lit by both commercial premises and streetlights and thus the level of illumination would not represent a dominant feature and would readily absorb into the street scene.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm visual amenity. I have taken into account Policy BH1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan 2015 – 2033, 2020 which explains amongst other things, that development should create places which have a clear function, character and identity based upon a robust understanding of local context, constraints and distinctiveness. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm visual amenity, the proposal would not conflict with this policy or paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

10. The five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations are imposed in the terms of my decision. I have also had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council in their Questionnaire although I find these to be the same as those standard conditions which already apply as part of this consent. I do not therefore need to repeat these. In addition to these, I find it necessary to impose a condition controlling the brightness, animation and the timing of image changes as well as requiring the display to freeze in the event of any malfunction. These are imposed in the interests of public safety and amenity.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR