



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/Z/24/3350992

89 Stanley Road, Cheadle Hulme, Stockport, Cheadle SK8 6PL

- 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 Marc Rutter against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is DC/092243.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as a 48-sheet standard billboard 6 metres wide x 3 metres high fixed to the existing gable wall of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary matters

3. Since the application was determined, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. However, as any policies that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.
4. The Council has drawn my attention to Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD (CS) and Saved Policy SE1.3 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (UDP) and I have taken them into account as a material consideration where relevant. However, powers under the Regulations¹ to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interest of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterates this approach. Therefore, in my consideration of this appeal, the Council's policies have not, in themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is the flank wall of an existing two-storey residential dwelling located on the southern side of Stanley Road, close to the junction of Stanley Road with Wilmslow-Handforth Bypass. The Council identifies the site as being within an Employment Area. There are several dwellings within the immediate area, and mostly commercial units to the south and west of the site.
7. The 48-sheet billboard sign would be positioned on the gable wall of an end of terrace dwelling and would be in an elevated position, around 2.85 metres from the ground. The context of the appeal site is determined by the surroundings in which the proposal would be seen. In this instance, notwithstanding the commercial properties to the south and west, the site is seen in the context of the large roundabout, vegetation, and residential properties.
8. Due to its size and elevated position, the billboard would be highly prominent in the street scene, not only for those travelling west on Stanley Road, but also for those engaging in the roundabout. I acknowledge that consideration has been given to the placement of the billboard in relation to the gable wall and that the development would utilise materials that would reflect contemporary standards. However, due to its size and location the development would appear out of place and dominant in this street context.
9. I note that the neighbouring commercial units, including Jewson's to the west, have advertisements displayed in various sizes. However, the development would not be seen in their context; furthermore, it is not directly comparable with them, as most of the existing advertisements relate to those businesses. Accordingly, the development would highly stand out, rather than balance the other elements of the street scene such as the traffic signage and lights, and thus it would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. This would be irrespective of the appeal site location outside a Conservation Area or outside any landscape designated area.
10. The submitted evidence shows an approved scheme for a McDonald's Restaurant, which would be located to the east of the appeal site. Based on the limited details before me, it appears that the appeal site would be seen alongside the McDonald premises, particularly when travelling west on Stanley Road. Nevertheless, any advertisements for the restaurant would likely be related to it. Thus, I can only afford limited weight to this matter.
11. Taking all of these factors into account, the proposed advertisement would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area. In this regard, and although they have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal, the proposal would not accord with the aims of Policy SIE-1 of the CS and Saved Policy SE1.3 of the UDP. Furthermore, due to the harm identified, the proposal cannot be considered sustainable development, and would also be contrary to the aims of the Framework in so far as it relates to this matter.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and with regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's recommendation, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR