
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/Z/25/3367534

2 Preston Road, Chorley PR7 1PZ

- 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 Limited against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00265/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement of existing advertisements with 1no. digital display ("D-Poster")
-

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 Matter

3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety. Neither the Council nor any other party has raised any objection to the proposed advertisement from a public safety perspective, and I see no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The Planning Practice Guidance sets out that in practice 'amenity' is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement, and the local characteristics of the neighbourhood should always be considered.
6. The proposed advertisement would be positioned on the gable side elevation of a detached dwelling situated adjacent to the junction of Preston Road/Street A6, a busy highway, and Park Road. The locality comprises of an assortment of land uses, including a dominance of commercial properties with various associated

signage along Preston Road/Street, together with predominantly residential Park Road.

7. Due to its elevated position above a pair of small roundabouts to the southeast and the extended break in development along this otherwise urban stretch, the gable wall is highly conspicuous in the street scene. There is an existing freestanding illuminated digital display of rotating advertisements located in close proximity to the site, adjacent to the nearest mini roundabout.
8. Two rectangular non-illuminated static advertisement boards for nearby businesses are currently displayed on the house's side elevation. These advertisements have been in situ for a significant period.
9. The proposed illuminated digital display of rotating advertisements would be significantly larger than the static existing boards, including extending to the building's eaves. By virtue of the large size, scale and elevated positioning, the display would present as a visually dominant and harmful feature on the prominent gable end of the building. The luminance presented by the digital display would compound this visual impact. In doing so, and notwithstanding the presence of the existing boards which it would replace, the advertisement would fail to have proper regard for the non-commercial context of attachment to a residential property and overbearing placement adjoining the community garden space.
10. I recognise that a variety of commercial advertisements are present along Preston Road/Street, largely positioned in direct relationship to the associated premises. However, whilst there is a variation in the scale and form of many of the advertisements, such signage does not generally appear as inappropriate within the heavily trafficked highway. In contrast, the proposed installation would introduce additional visual clutter within the street scene due to the non-site specific nature of its changing display and taking into consideration the presence of an advertisement of the same type in very close proximity. The proposed display would therefore constitute an unsympathetic proliferation of its kind in a mixed use neighbourhood, jarring with the prevailing characteristics of the street scene.
11. The appellant's evidence references several similar advertisements in the vicinity, albeit that some are located within the jurisdiction of other local planning authorities. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to each these proposals being accepted and I am not satisfied that any represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including in respect of size and scale and the individual site context. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits and have afforded very limited weight to these examples.
12. I therefore conclude that, due to its overall size, height and positioning, the proposed advertisement would appear as a visually dominant feature at the site which would harm the amenity of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which cautions that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

13. The perceived benefits of 48-sheet size digital advertising, including versus classic 'poster and paste', as put forward by the appellant are noted. However, this proposal is not for a replacement of an existing 48-sheet display and in any event

such benefits are not relevant to the consideration of amenity and public safety matters only.

14. That the appeal site is not located within any designated scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features is a neutral matter which neither weighs in favour nor against the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR