



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/Z/25/3373274

Bulls Head, 2 Cross Street, Sale, Trafford M33 7AE

- 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 Mr S Collett of Stonegate Group against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 116564/ADV/25.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1no. externally illuminated box sign and 1no. externally illuminated fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1no. externally illuminated box sign and 1no. externally illuminated fascia sign at Bulls Head, 2 Cross Street, Sale, Trafford M33 7AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 116564/ADV/25, dated 05 June 2025. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, and the following additional condition:-
 - 1) The illumination level of the advertisements hereby approved shall be in compliance with the Institute of Lighting Engineers' Technical Report Number 5. For the avoidance of doubt the illuminance levels shall not exceed 250 cd/m² and shall be static.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council issued a split decision which granted consent for some of the advertisements applied for¹. The appeal therefore relates to the refused advertisements only. I have used the description as detailed on the Decision Notice of the Council insofar as it relates to these refused advertisements. This is because it accurately and concisely describes the advertisements proposed.
3. At the time the application was considered by the Council, I understand that the advertisements were in situ and express consent was sought retrospectively. However, at the time of my site visit both advertisements which are the subject of this appeal had been removed. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.

¹ 2 x Double sided hanging signs

Main Issue

4. The Regulations to control advertisements require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any concerns on public safety grounds and I have no reason to disagree.
5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the advertisements on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

6. The Bulls Head is a large two-storey building which is prominently sited at the crossroad junction of Washway Road/Cross Street (the A56) and School Road/Ashton Road. The flank elevation of the building addresses an adjacent car park and is prominent in close views along Cross Street. The building is identified on the Council's Local Heritage List and the Council consider the building to be a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). The Local List² provides a good understanding of the significance of the NDHA. I agree that the significance of the building lies within its architectural features and detailing along with its prominent location on a busy crossroads. Its significance is also derived from its cultural and historic value which arises from its use as a public house/hotel.
7. The proposed fascia sign would be rectangular, displaying the name of the premises in white lettering set against a black background. The sign would be positioned at first floor level on the grey painted flank elevation of the building. The flank elevation is large and the sign would only occupy a small proportion of the overall elevation. Therefore, the advertisement would not be a dominant addition to this elevation. The proposed colour palette of the sign, together with its simple lettering, would ensure that the advertisement would appear as a subtle addition set against the more dominant expanse of elevation. Furthermore, the use of external illumination for the sign would ensure that the advertisement would appear discrete during hours of darkness. As such, I consider that this advertisement would not appear as a prominent or incongruous addition to the building or surrounding area.
8. The proposed box sign would be positioned at first floor level on the corner oriel window. This directly addresses the crossroads and is a prominent elevation adjacent to the heavily trafficked A56. The advertisement would be rectangular with a vertical emphasis. Its overall height and width would be slightly larger than the first-floor openings of the building. Notwithstanding this, it would remain viewed in the context of the adjacent elevations and its coverage would not occupy a significant proportion of the visible elevation(s). The proportions and alignment of the advertisement, being similar to the existing first-floor openings, would mean that the general rhythm of openings would not be disrupted. Furthermore, like the fascia sign, the proposed colour palette, lettering, and use of external lighting, is appropriate and would ensure that the sign would not appear as an unduly prominent advertisement on the building.
9. I acknowledge that there would be some minor loss of visible architectural detailing above and below the window. Albeit such detailing would not be permanently lost. The loss of visible features would represent only a small part of the building and visual appreciation of the architectural features, on the building as a whole, would

² Local Heritage Listing Project, Sale Gazetteer (dated May 2024)

not be diluted to any harmful extent. Furthermore, I also do not consider that there would be an unacceptable proliferation of signage which would undermine any visual appreciation of the NDHA. Whilst not determinative, I am also mindful that the evidence suggests that there has been an advertisement in situ, in this position, and of similar size, for many years.

10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisements would not be harmful to the amenity of the area. I have had regard to the provisions of Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Development Plan Document, so far as material to amenity, in accordance with the Regulations. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the amenity of the area, it would accord with these policies.

Conditions and conclusion

11. In terms of conditions, in addition to those required by the Regulations, a condition restricting illumination is necessary in the interests of both amenity and public safety.
12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR