



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/Z/19/3239376

Land North Of Welkin Road Junction With Stockport Road West, Lower Bredbury, Stockport Easting (x) 391097, Northing (y) 391038

- 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 Moviescape Ltd against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/074316, dated 26 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of a non-illuminated freestanding advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located adjacent to the junction of Welkin Road and Stockport Road West and opposite the junction and entrance road to Pear Mill. Both Pear Mill and Welkin Road contain a number of commercial units, many of which have advertisements at the junction creating a somewhat cluttered appearance.
4. This part of Stockport Road West contains a number of built features including, amongst other things, a large number of advertisements and a car breakers and storage unit. However, along this section of the road the river, trees and fields and the position of the commercial units all combine to create an open and spacious appearance that positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. In this context, I find that the sign subject of this appeal, by reason of its size and location at the junction, would be an unduly prominent and intrusive feature. The appeal scheme would add to the cluster of individual signage on both sides of Stockport Road West exacerbating the existing cluttered appearance. The combination of which would result in a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the site and its surroundings.

6. No details of any relevant permissions for any of the other existing advertisements along this part of Stockport West Road have been submitted with this appeal. I cannot therefore be sure of the context or circumstances in which they were granted, and I understand that not all benefit from a consent. In any case this appeal is being determined on its own merits.
7. My attention has been drawn to several local policies including Policy CS8 and SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD (2011) which have been cited in the reason for refusal as well as the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have taken them into account as material considerations, the power to control advertisements under the regulations may be exercised only in the interests of public safety and amenity. Consequently, in my determination of this appeal, these matters have not, themselves, been decisive.
8. I recognise the appellant's case to advertise the business from the junction and understand that there would be benefits to the business and the Mill. However, there is no substantive evidence before me that the proposed advertisement would result in environmental and landscape benefits as suggested by the appellant. Moreover, the benefits do not outweigh the harm to the visual amenity of the area that I have identified from the proliferation of individual advertisements at this junction.
9. For all these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR