



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2023

by **N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/Z/22/3311858

Advertising Right Adjacent 47, Clarendon Place, Hyde, Tameside SK14 2ND

- 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 Global against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00825/ADV, dated 9 August 2022 was refused by notice dated 4 October 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is non-illuminated timber poster panel.
-

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 with specific regard to character and appearance.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located immediately adjacent to the gable end of 47 Clarendon Place, an end of terrace property on the corner of Clarendon Place and Clark Way, which is on a busy intersection. The uses in the immediate vicinity are predominantly commercial, with several businesses located within premises along Clarendon Place. A fast-food outlet is located on the corner of Clarendon Place and Union Street opposite the site, and a large supermarket is located off Mottram Road. There are residential flats located nearby on Mottram Road. The building has an existing small advertisement at first floor level advertising a carpet shop.
4. The proposed advertisement due to the extent of its width and height would be extremely prominent and would dominate the gable end and the immediate vicinity. This is especially the case when viewed on the approach from Mottram Road and Union Street. Due to its height and size, it would also be likely to be visible from more distant views.
5. Whilst the area has a mixed character with commercial and residential uses nearby, there are no advertising hoardings of this scale in the vicinity. I consider that the proposed poster panel would be at odds with the character of the area, where existing advertisements are mainly related to the premises they serve and are of a more proportionate scale.
6. For these reasons I conclude that the poster panel by virtue of its size and siting would result in an incongruous addition which would be visually harmful

to the amenity of the area having specific regard to character and appearance. I have taken into account Policy C1 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan Written Statement Adopted Plan – November 2004 which seeks to protect amenity and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with this policy and paragraph 136 of the Framework which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

7. A previous appeal decision has been brought to my attention. Whilst this was for an illuminated advertisement at the same site, the Inspector dismissed the appeal due to concerns regarding amenity based on siting, design, height and type of illumination. I do not consider the alteration of the scheme, including the omission of illumination of the advertisement, to overcome the issues the previous Inspector raised against the proposal in relation to amenity.
8. The Appellant has provided details of email correspondence between the Appellant and the Council during the process of the application, where the Council's Officer appears to have been supportive of the scheme. However, this does not reflect the final decision of the Council, therefore this does not affect the considerations that have led to my decision.
9. In the evidence provided the Appellant has stated that the poster panel would utilise the area of land that does not have any other use. Whilst it would provide a use for the site this matter does not outweigh the harm identified in my reasoning above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the proposed non-illuminated timber poster panel would be harmful to the amenity of the area, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR