



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/Z/25/3362962
744 Halifax Road, Rochdale, OL16 2SQ

- 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 Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01176/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of 1no. illuminated digital advertisement display unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the area; and its effect on the amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at number 742 Halifax Road (number 742).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace two-storey dwelling, which is situated on a main road within an area of mixed uses. The property is positioned forward of the neighbouring dwelling at number 742, with its gable wall almost entirely in front of the front elevation of 742. An existing advertisement display is fixed to the gable wall.
4. The proposal is to replace the existing advertisement board with a modern digital display, which would be the same size and in the same position as the existing. The appellant states that it would display multiple static adverts on rotation, and it would be controlled by timers and light sensors that would conform to the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance.
5. The Council states that the proposal would be obtrusive in the streetscene and harmful to the amenity of the occupants of number 742. It refers to a conflict with Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan. Amongst other things, these policies generally seek to ensure that the design of development is of a high standard and respects the character and identity of the area. These policies are not determinative, as proposals for Advertisement Consent are determined solely in relation to amenity and public safety. Nevertheless, the policies assist in understanding the Council's reasoning.

6. I have stated above that the area is mixed in character and, consequently, there are other advertisements on sites and buildings along this stretch of Halifax Road. However, with the exception of the nearby petrol station, these are generally smaller scale and predominantly consist of fascia and/or small projecting signs.
7. Although the proposal would replace the existing advertisement board on the appeal building, the proposed display unit would have a greater visual impact, because of its illumination and changing displays. In that regard, I consider that it would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene.
8. Furthermore, the proposed display would also have a greater impact on the occupants of number 742 than the existing, because of the illumination and the frequent rotation of the adverts. Although, the appellant states that these impacts could be controlled by conditions, I am not persuaded that these concerns could be satisfactorily mitigated.
9. In reaching my decision, I have noted the various decisions that the appellant has submitted and considers to be comparable to the appeal proposal. These relate to different locations in different parts of the country and some are in areas where the relationship with nearby housing is different. Therefore, they do not attract any significant weight in my decision.
10. I have also given weight to the various benefits of digital advertising and to the fact that there are no objections in relation to public safety. However, these do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR