
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2023

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/22/3307491

80 Stockport Road, Manchester M12 6AL

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 134445/AOH/2022, dated 18 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of 48 sheet digital advert.
-

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.

Reasons

3. The proposal would be located at an elevated position on a brick side wall which lies at the junction of Stockport Road with Polygon Avenue. The building itself extends along Stockport Road and contains a row of local shops at ground floor level with associated fascia signs and the occasional hanging sign. Despite some alterations, the building overall retains an attractive period appearance. It contains a turret feature close to where the proposal would be located, amongst other decorative features.
4. On this side of Stockport Road, the use is predominantly residential. A terraced row of such properties lies to the rear of the site and beyond an area of open space between Polygon Avenue and Lauderdale Crescent, there are more modern residential properties. Stockport Road is a major route and on the opposite side are found more commercial uses, including a large wholesaler. There is also a large freestanding advertisement hoarding on that side of the road.
5. It is not in dispute there was formerly an advertisement hoarding in a similar position on the appeal property to where the proposal would be sited. However, there are now few signs of its former presence, save from parts of how it would have been fitted to the wall. The wall has now largely returned to its former state and thus its contribution to the appreciation of the building

- remains. As a consequence, the proposal is to be considered within this context.
6. The size, location and elevated position of the proposal would form an incongruous feature when seen against the backdrop of this pleasing end elevation of the building in the streetscene. Its design and appearance would be an unduly obtrusive and an over dominant feature. Nor would it be viewed contextually with the existing shop signage because that is at ground floor level and those signs are considerably less in size. In the absence of the former sign, the building is only now an established location for advertising as regards the shop signage.
 7. The means of illumination and the digital nature of the proposed display, even with it displaying a series of static images, would be further at odds with its location on this side of Stockport Road. This would result in an uncharacteristic form of advertisement compared to the existing shop signage and contribute to the overall obtrusive impact on the streetscene. It would also exacerbate its presence, particularly with the visibility that would be afforded to both motorists and pedestrians approaching the proposal from a south easterly direction. That it would adhere to the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidelines¹ would not address that it would detract from the visual amenity of the area.
 8. Whilst not decisive on its own, the proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the occupiers of the properties on Lauderdale Crescent that would directly face it, in particular with the illumination. Despite of the separation provided by the open space and the associated tree coverage, it would likely appear as a distracting and discordant elevated feature, compared to the existing side wall. The level of adverse effect would be less to the occupiers of the properties on Polygon Avenue because they would not have direct views. However, the effect on those occupiers on Lauderdale Crescent would further demonstrate the unsuitability of the proposal in amenity terms.
 9. Where the Planning Practice Guidance: Advertisements² (PPG) refers to the permitting of a large poster-hoarding in an industrial or commercial area of a major city (where there are large buildings and main highways) where the advertisement would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood of the site, this more appropriately applies to the opposite side of Stockport Road. This has noticeably more of a commercial character, and the existing large freestanding advertisement hoarding is consistent with its location. The same applies to where I have been referred to signage at a roundabout towards the city centre. As I have set out, the character on the same side of Stockport Road as the site is markedly more residential in nature and with more diminutive signage associated with local shops.
 10. Similar advertisements that have been allowed on appeal that I have been referred to on Stockport Road³ are a considerable distance from the site. In addition, they are in locations where there is a distinctly greater clustering of shop and commercial development. A site in Tong Street, Bradford⁴ that I have also been pointed to clearly does not substantively inform an appreciation

¹ Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance document PLG05 – The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements 2015

² Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306

³ Appeal refs: APP/B4215/Z/20/3254227, APP/B4215/Z/22/3296481

⁴ Appeal ref: APP/W4705/Z/19/3241007

of the effect on the host building itself and area. Such matters depend on a particular consideration of the character, the contribution of the appeal site to it and then the proposal. None of this alters my conclusion.

11. I conclude that the proposed advertisement would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area. As such, it would not comply with paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
12. I have taken into account Policies EN1, SP1 and DM1 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and Saved Policies E3.3, DC15.1 and DC15.2 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995) which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, it would conflict with these policies.

Other Matters

13. The main parties agree that the effect on public safety would not be unacceptable. In this respect, the proposal would not cause road safety issues with its siting. This would not address though the concerns over amenity.
14. A number of matters have been raised pertaining to the environmental, social and economic benefits of the proposal. However, advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. There is no indication in the Regulations, the Framework or the PPG that any other factors can be taken into account either for, or indeed against, the advertisement as proposed.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR