
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/Z/25/3371772

38 Moor Street, Congleton CW12 1QH

- 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 Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1512/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of a D48 illuminated advertising display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons

3. The advertisement would be fixed to the gable end of No 38 Moor Street, a 2 storey dwelling with its side gable fronting onto a small public car park and the roundabout junction of Moor Street and Mountbatten Way, which forms a busy arterial route through the town. The surrounding area is mixed in character. The neighbouring buildings are predominantly domestic in scale and signage connected with businesses are generally restricted to fascia signage and small scale signage on the gables of properties. Very few appear to be illuminated.
4. The proposed advertisement would measure approximately 6m x 3m and would display static advertisements on rotation. A large proportion of the end elevation would be covered by the advertisement.
5. The scale of the advertisement would dominate the gable of the property and as a result would appear visually alien and less than low-key in this highly visible location. Even with restricted and variable luminance levels it would nevertheless be a bright feature in the street scene, and as a result would appear jarringly out of place. Although Mountbatten Way is a busy route through the town, the proposed location of the advertisement relates more closely with the domestic form of buildings on Moor Street where advertisements of this scale are not prevalent.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to amenity due to its size, positioning, illumination and display of changing images. I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan, in so far as they are relevant, in accordance with the Regulations. Policy GEN3 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (December 2022) and Policies SD1, SD2 and

SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (July 2017) seek to secure development which contributes to protecting and enhancing the built environment, contributes positively to an area's character and protects amenity and so are material in this case together with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Other Matters

7. Reference has been made by the appellant to several other advertisements within the surrounding area which are stated as being similar to the proposal. None of these advertisements could be viewed in context with the appeal site. They were also very different in character and scale to the proposal. Furthermore, I do not have their precise details before me or indeed what consent they benefit from. The existence of other advertisements in urban locations does not, in any event, equate to the acceptability of an advertisement in the location proposed, and do not lead me to an alternative conclusion. I also note that the proposal may facilitate the removal of other less well-located advertisements elsewhere. I have no details of these before me and no mechanism to ensure that the removal of these would take place.
8. I have had regard to the fact that the proposal could be used to advertise local businesses or broadcast emergency information and therefore have some public and economic benefits. Nevertheless, these benefits would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. The appeal site is not located in a conservation area or statutory landscape and is not within the setting of any heritage assets. These are not factors which weigh in favour of allowing the appeal and do not diminish the harm that I have found on the main issue.
10. I have also given weight to the various benefits of digital advertisements as outlined by the appellant and 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 I conclude that the display of the proposed advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity, therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR