



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2025

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/Z/24/3353794

Chapman Scaffolding Ltd – Land and Engine Shed, Park Road, Stretford, Manchester M32 8RB

- 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 Mike Keys of Chapman Scaffolding Ltd against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref 114038/ADV/24.
 - The application seeks express consent for 1 no. digital display screen located on new proposed office building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
3. The description of development used in the heading above differs from that used on the original application form and instead the description is that as used by the Council on their decision notice. I consider that the description of development still accurately reflects the proposal before me and as such I have used this description accordingly.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The proposal before me seeks permission for an illuminated display screen measuring around 7m x 4m to be located upon the first floor level end elevation of a proposed (as yet unbuilt) new office building¹. The proposal would therefore be interlinked with the construction of this building.

¹ Application ref: 112733/FUL/24 for three storey office building.

6. The site of the proposed hoarding and the office building would be upon a prominent plot to the edge of the existing Kellogg's factory site upon an area of former railway use. An overhead conveyor structure associated with the Kellogg's site runs diagonally through this site and the plot of the proposed office building would be to the western half of the plot immediately adjacent to the main Park Road. The site is therefore located to the edge of Park Road and has a long distance axis onto Barton Dock Road that extends opposite the site in an east west direction.
7. I saw on my site visit that there was once a traditional paper style hoarding affixed to an existing building that is now partially obscured from the road side being to the east of the Kellogg's conveyor structure.
8. In assessing this appeal I am aware of the Council's Supplementary Guidance Note (SPD) on Advertisements that I consider still provides useful background in addressing the aims of the Framework in achieving good design. The SPD makes particular reference to the prominence of digital advertisements recognising that such hoardings, where presented too high or over too long a distance, can be overbearing or harmful to an area.
9. Although I note that the overriding character of the area is one of industry and fragmented townscape, the underlying road structure is one where this site has great potential to be seen. The proposed hoarding would therefore be visible from a very great distance along the very straight Barton Dock Road that runs opposite this site. Views along this road effectively terminate at this site and this would make the proposed signage not only prominent due to its height upon the proposed building, but also prominent due to its visibility over a very long distance.
10. In essence, the proposed building would terminate this view with a modern office structure. However, through placing this large hoarding so prominent and so high, the proposed scheme would undermine the positive benefits of having a building in this location and would diminish the potential for the area to benefit from such new built development. Although the proposed building would present an inactive frontage in this direction, I am unable to see how the proposed advertisement would be able to better this. Being 7m wide the hoarding would still appear prominent and would, moreover, take up all of the width and upper storey height of this building up to a height almost equivalent to the building's three storeys.
11. As such, I do find that this proposal would represent a poor design response that would have a harmful impact over a very great distance, especially when approaching the site along Barton Dock Road. It effectively covers the proposed new building and replaces it with a digital display at a very prominent, even landmark, location.
12. As such, the design of the proposed digital illuminated advert would cause significant enough harm to the amenity of the area to lead me to the conclusion that this proposal would be in conflict with Policy JP-P12 of the Places for Everyone Plan and the guidance within SPD 14 regarding advertisements. The proposal would also be in conflict with the overriding policy criteria contained within the Framework and that the scheme would, ultimately, be detrimental to the amenity of the area through its prominence and dominance over a large distance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above, taking into account the particular criteria of this proposal, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR