



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2019

by Laura Renaudon LLM LARTPI Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/Z/19/3221788

139 Manchester Road, Droylsden, Greater Manchester M43 6EG

- 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 Mr D. Knebel against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00295/ADV, dated 24 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 January 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is to replace existing main central advertising hoarding with LED display screen and retrospectively for 4 small hoardings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed advertisements on the visual amenity of the area and public safety.

Reasons

Amenity

3. The appeal site lies at the junction of the busy A662, Manchester Road, with Clegg Street in Droylsden. The proposed advertisements would be sited on the eastern gable end of the property at 139 Manchester Road, directly opposite open green space but visible to eastbound traffic on the A662. Adjoining the carriageway to the south lies the Cemetery Road tram stop. The tramlines depart from the A662 at its junction with Clegg Street into the tram stop, re-joining the carriageway further west. To the east of the appeal site on the A662 lie terraced commercial properties, and to the west the A662 and the open green space are mostly surrounded by residential dwellings, and so the appeal site lies at a point of transition. The streetscape is very busy, with streetlamps, traffic lights at the junction, the tram stop, cycle paths, overhead tram lines, railings and other paraphernalia including advertisements. A large billboard covers much of the gable end of the opposite property, at the junction of the A662 with Cemetery Road leading off to the north.
4. The appeal proposal is to retain 4 non-illuminated hoardings each measuring around 1.7m x 1.2m and to replace an existing larger hoarding, centrally located on the property's gable end, with an internally illuminated LED screen hoarding which would be slightly smaller, and positioned higher, than the

existing hoarding. The Council does not object to the retention of the 4 smaller hoardings. The LED screen hoarding would be illuminated between 300 and 4800 cd/m² with displays of static content, which might include content placed by public services such as the Council or the Police, transitioning every 10 seconds.

5. The gable end of the appeal property faces onto public open space and a number of dwellings, and the prominently-sited LED illuminated advertisement would appear incongruous in this residential area. It would add to the clutter of the advertisements in the street scene and would be visually jarring and out of character with the dwellings and open space onto which it would face. Amenity would be harmed. I have taken into account paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, advising that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed, as this illuminated advertisement would be. I have also taken into account policies 1.5 and C1 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan of November 2004, seeking to promote quality of life and to respect local character and fabric, and so are relevant to the question of amenity and so I have paid them due regard. Given I have found that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal would conflict with these policies.

Public safety

6. The local highway authority has raised an objection on the grounds that road users of Manchester Road and Clegg Street would be sufficiently distracted by the LED advertisement so as to create danger to themselves and other road users. This is because of the size, location and lighting of the advertisement. The advertisement would face immediately onto Clegg Street and would not be readily discernible by the road users below it, and so I do not consider that the safety concerns in this respect are justified.
7. For the users of Manchester Road, however, the LED advertisement would be very conspicuous as the eastbound users approach the traffic lights and pass through the junction. At the time of my site visit I saw that the traffic lights' sequence took around a minute to complete, with the Manchester Road lights on red for nearly 20 seconds. There are pedestrian crossings at the junction, the tram lines cross the road at the junction, and there are also cycle paths and crossings, all giving road users a great deal to contend with. Although each advertisement would itself be static, the addition of an illuminated advertisement away from the direct sight line of the road ahead, with a frequently changing display, would be a source of confusion and distraction for road users that I consider would create an unacceptable risk of danger. Therefore the proposal would not be conducive to public safety.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, the interests of both amenity and public safety lead me to dismiss the appeal.

Laura Renaudon

INSPECTOR