



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/Z/20/3250415

55 High Street, Cheadle SK8 1BJ

- 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 Andrew Bragg against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/075484 is dated 13 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as a gable mounted externally illuminated timber sign with timber frame around the display area, which measures 2.0m high x 1.2m wide.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on High Street, it is a traditional two storey, brick built end terraced property, with a timber shopfront, comprising of a non-illuminated narrow fascia board extending over the window. The side gable of the building is a prominent feature within the street. The site lies within the Cheadle Village Conservation Area (the CA).
4. The CA covers the commercial centre of Cheadle and surrounding residential areas. High Street is characterised by its strong linear building line between St Mary's Parish Church and Cheadle Green. Whilst there is some diversity in the types and period styles of buildings, the traditional 19th and 20th century style terraced properties, that are constructed in traditional materials reflect the historical and architectural interest of the area.
5. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
6. The proposal is for a large timber framed sign, with a projecting external lighting unit mounted above. The advert would be erected at the first floor level on the gable wall of the property. Other than a narrow ground floor window, this elevation is predominantly blank.

7. The advert would be of a significant scale, and due to its elevated height at first floor level, it would be a dominant feature on the side of the building. By reason of its size, prominence and illumination, it would result in a conspicuous and discordant intrusion into the street scene, when viewed along High Street from the east, and in the context of the CA. As such, the appeal proposal would harm the amenity of the area, and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
8. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material. Saved Policy HC1.3 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (May 2006), and Policies SIE-1 and SIE-3 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework, Core Strategy DPD (2011), which collectively seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. I have concluded that the advertisements would harm amenity, and therefore the appeal proposal conflicts with these policies.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the examples provided of other advertisements. Whilst there are a variety within the vicinity of the site, these differ in that they are mounted on more modern buildings, consist of fascia signs, or are not at first floor level. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances of this appeal.
10. I note the Solihull decision¹ provided. However, that case differs in that the Inspector found that the advertisement could not be seen from within the Conservation Area. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances of this appeal.
11. Whilst I accept external advertisements are important in communicating with customers and stimulating business, there is no substantive evidence before that the economic benefits would outweigh the harm caused to amenity. Therefore, this does not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Q4625/Z/19/3221925