

|                               |                                                                                                                              |                             |                      |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <b><u>APPLICATION NO:</u></b> | 26/00218/ADV                                                                                                                 | <b><u>CASE OFFICER:</u></b> | Lee Osborne          |
| <b><u>WARD:</u></b>           | Prescot North                                                                                                                | <b><u>PARISH:</u></b>       | Prescot Town Council |
| <b><u>LOCATION:</u></b>       | 73 Warrington Road, Prescot, Knowsley                                                                                        |                             |                      |
| <b><u>PROPOSAL:</u></b>       | DISPLAY OF SIGNAGE COMPRISING 1NO. NON-ILLUMINATED GLOSS LAMINATE DI-BOND SIGN TO SIDE ELEVATION OF BUILDING (RETROSPECTIVE) |                             |                      |

---

### **Site Description**

The application is for the retention of 1no. non-illuminated sign on the side elevation of a semi-detached building comprising an electrical appliance (TV) repair and sales shop on the ground floor and a soft furnishing company (e.g. curtains, blinds, cushions etc) on the first floor. The building is between Albany Road and Columbia Road, Prescot and located adjacent to an area of open land with footpath, This grassed area has an advertising hoarding displayed adjacent it and a gated access alley for properties on Columbia Road which was allowed on appeal (18/00382/ADV). The adjacent property is currently in use as a Chinese restaurant with what appears to be living accommodation above.

### **Advertisement Details**

The sign was installed in March 2025. The sign has a width of 6m and a height of 2.4m and the bottom of the sign is 2.8m from ground level. The sign is set in from front and rear elevations of the building by 1.55m. The sign is a d-bond gloss laminated sign, and is orange in colour with white lettering, and the company name being in black lettering. The signage presents mostly to traffic travelling southwards along Warrington Road away from the town centre, although is visible travelling northwards when past Albany Road.

### **Consultations**

Prescot Town Council - No comments received.

### **Representations**

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours. It has also been advertised by site notice. No representations have been received.

### **Planning History**

K/APP/1078 – CHANGE OF USE OF SHOP TO A FRIED FISH AND CHIP SHOP.  
Refused: 03.02.1976.

02/00234/FUL – CHANGE OF USE FROM VACANT ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS OFFICE AND STORAGE TO TELEVISION REPAIR AND SALES SHOP AND INSTALLATION OF NEW SHOP FRONT. Granted: 10.05.2002.

20/00259/FUL – ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE). Granted: 13.07.2020.

### **Relevant Policy**

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF clarifies that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

The development plan in Knowsley comprises the Saved Policies of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Joint Waste Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

### **KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY**

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

### **SAVED POLICIES – KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)**

S10 - Advertisements

### **Article 35 Statement**

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Assessment**

Advertisements are controlled under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007. Regulation 3 requires Local Planning Authorities to control the display of advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, in so far as they are material, and other relevant factors.

Paragraph 141 of the NPPF states that ‘the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. A separate consent process

within the planning system controls the display of advertisements, which should be operated in a way which is simple, efficient and effective. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

### Amenity

Whilst the sign is visible whilst travelling along Warrington Road away from Prescot town centre, and towards the town centre once past Albany Road the sign sits comfortably against the gable of the building in terms of scale. The sign whilst prominent on the gable is not overly dominant and is of a type and in a location not uncommon within urban areas. It is considered that the sign does not detract from its immediate surroundings or from the visual amenity of the areas either as an individual sign, or cumulatively with the sign adjacent the access alley for the terraced houses on Columbia Road and which is sited approximately 22m from Warrington Road carriageway pavement.

The sign complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy S10 of the UDP.

### Public Safety

The sign is non-illuminated and site on a gable in view of on-coming traffic and typically found in similar urban locations. The sign is not distracting to any significant degree to traffic. The sign has been on display over a year and there is no evidence that the sign has caused any traffic accidents. As such the sign is considered to not be detrimental to public safety.

### Appeal Decision for the Nearby Digital Sign Considerations

An application was received in 2018 for the replacement of 1no. 96-sheet and 1no. 48-sheet illuminated advertising displays with 1no. 48-sheet digitally illuminated advertising display. The application was refused and an appeal lodged. An appeal was lodged against the decision (APP/V4305/Z/18/3213365) and also against a discontinuance notice served with regard the existing signage the proposal was to replace (.APP/V4305/G/18/3216443)

The discontinuance notice appeal was dismissed with the discontinuance notice coming back into effect immediately and the use of the site for the display of the advertisements to cease within 21 days of the date of the appeal decision. The Inspector noted that the advertisement panels, collectively and given their size are prominent features of the area around the junction of Warrington Road and Columbia Road. The Inspector stated that they dominated the grassed area which is an important townscape feature on the main road. The panels, the Inspector noted that particularly those on the north side of the grassed area, and especially the 96 sheet panel, detract from the vista along Warrington Road for drivers and passengers in vehicles approaching the town centre. The Inspector dismissed this appeal on the grounds that the advertisement panels were substantially detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

With regards the appeal against the refusal of advertisement consent for the proposed replacement sign the Inspector concluded that the display would be similar in width to the gable end and it would be below eaves level of the terrace. In this regard the Inspector noted the display, unlike the 96 sheet panel as then in place and in a similar position, would be relatively unobtrusive. The changing images the

Inspector advised would draw the eyes of pedestrians and those in vehicles on Warrington Road but not to such a degree that the display would be regarded to be visually intrusive and display would not detract from its immediate surroundings or from the visual amenity of the area. The Inspector advised that the former watch factory (a listed building) redevelopment scheme was well contained and the proposed display would not have any adverse effect on the setting of the listed buildings. With regards public safety the Inspector noted that there was no evidence that the existing at the time advertisement panels, illuminated albeit non changing, had contributed to accidents that had occurred in recent years in the vicinity of the site. The Inspector informed that the display would change on a 10 second rotation so no driver of a vehicle would see more than two displays, that the daytime and night-time illuminance levels would not exceed recommended levels and conditions have been suggested that would prevent the display causing any concern for public safety.

Given that the current application sign is less in width than the gable of the building (unlike the appeal allowed sign which is approximately the width of the Columbia Road terrace), is non-digital and non-illuminated and faces traffic leaving the town centre in the main, it is considered cumulatively and singularly that the application sign has no significant adverse impacts on amenity or public safety.

### **Conclusion**

The sign is acceptable in relation to amenity and public safety. The application complies with national and local planning policies and is recommended for approval.

### **Recommendation**

That Advertisement Consent be granted, subject to the following condition:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

### **SCHEDULE 1**

| <b>Date Received</b> | <b>Ref. No</b> | <b>Version</b> | <b>Drawing/Document Title</b>           |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------|
|                      |                |                |                                         |
| <b>19/05/2026</b>    | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>       | <b>LOCATION PLAN</b>                    |
| <b>19/05/2026</b>    | <b>01</b>      | <b>-</b>       | <b>SITE PLAN</b>                        |
| <b>19/05/2026</b>    | <b>02</b>      | <b>-</b>       | <b>EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS</b> |

**Signed Case Officer<sup>1</sup>:**     Lee Osborne

---

<sup>1</sup> I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

**Signed Authorising  
Officer<sup>2</sup>:**

**Jo Sheridan**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Date:**

**16/07/2026**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>2</sup> I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed