



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2024

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/Z/24/3347993

2 Villdale Avenue, Offerton, Stockport SK2 5SQ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Syed Bukhari against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/091896.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of an advertisement (flag) on a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Regulations¹ require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterate this approach. I have taken account of the policies the Council considers to be relevant to this appeal insofar as they relate to amenity and public safety.
3. I have taken the description of the advertisement from the decision notice and appeal form, as this is more concise. As I saw, the flagpole and flag were already in situ, I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a predominantly residential area with properties of similar characteristics and features which adds to the simplistic residential nature and character of the area. The property itself sits within a prominent position along the street scene on a corner plot at the junction of Villdale Avenue and Lindbury Avenue.
6. As I saw, there is little visual domestic paraphernalia or clutter along the front/side elevations in view or on the roofs of nearby properties. There appeared to be modest street furniture on Villdale Avenue and the residential area is devoid of any advertisements on properties or sited within curtilages.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended).

7. The flagpole sits elevated and attached to the rear elevation of the property with the pennant flag attached rising above the first-floor level. This results in it being highly visible along the street scene and its visual presence clear to adjacent residents and passes-by. This is further exacerbated by the significant gap between No.2 and No.4 Villdale Avenue. The siting of the flag to the rear of the property does little to prevent this, even if it is below the ridge height.
8. Therefore, the advertisement is afforded significant public views from neighbouring properties, gardens and directly along Villdale Avenue. There are also glancing views of the flag itself, when looking across to the rear of the property from a viewpoint along Lindbury Avenue. I would disagree that the colour of the flag results in it being inconspicuous given its existing prominent siting and height.
9. There are no other advertisements, flags or flagpoles erected in the vicinity of the appeal site and the advertisement is uncharacteristic of the area and adds unnecessary visual clutter of a considerable height which can be viewed from the public realm. Thus, it causes harm to the amenity of the area by adding an incongruous and unnecessary addition to the street scene where there is limited domestic clutter or any existing advertisements.
10. The appellant has referred to other flag advertisements, however I do not have the precise details of these. Furthermore, given that they are a significant distance away from the area including in different Boroughs they do not form part of the character of the area of which I am required to assess in this case, and the impact of this advertisement upon its amenity. I therefore give no weight to precedence.
11. Consequently, I conclude due to the height and siting, the advertisement has an adverse effect on the amenity of the area. I have taken into account Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council, Core Strategy DPD, 2011 which seeks to protect amenity, achieving quality places and so is material in this case. Given I have concluded that the advertisement harms amenity, it conflicts with this policy. Moreover, it is further in conflict with the Framework, paragraph 141 with regards to achieving well-designed places and that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

12. The Council acknowledge that the proposal would not have an adverse impact with respect to highway safety, public safety or factors relating to cultural or similar interests. However, these are neutral considerations weighting neither for nor against the display of the advertisement.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K A Taylor

INSPECTOR