



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/Z/25/3372082

29 Hall Street, Offerton, Stockport SK1 4DA

- 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 Adam Griffiths of Crystal Clear Media Group Limited against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/094602.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'single LED illuminated 48-Sheet Advertisement (3.2m tall x 6.2m wide) on the gable wall'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterate this approach. I have taken Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (March 2011) (Core Strategy) and saved Policy SE1.3 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (May 2006) (UDP Review) into account as a material consideration; however, they have not, by themselves, been determinative for this appeal.
3. The Council raise no concerns in relation to public safety and based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I see no reason to take a different view.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity, including the setting of a Grade II listed building.

Reasons

5. The advertisement would be fixed to the side gable wall of 29 Hall Street, a two-storey dwelling slightly elevated above a small grass verge alongside Turncroft Lane. The locality is predominantly residential in character except for a community church on the opposite side of Hall Street and a petrol filling station on the opposite side of Turncroft Lane. These premises contain advertisements, but they are very different in character to the proposal. They are smaller static non-illuminated and illuminated signage including a typical totem, all directly connected to the use of the premises. Beyond the petrol filling station lies a large 4-way road junction with St Marys Way.

6. The proposed advertisement would be attached to the side gable wall of the appeal building situated at high level, such that a large proportion of the flank elevation would be covered by the advertisement. It would measure approximately 6.2m x 3.2m and would display static advertisements on rotation. Whilst the gable wall does not contain any architectural features, the scale of the advertisement would still dominate it, appearing intrusive and incongruous in its context.
7. Views of the advertisement from residential properties on Turncroft Lane would be partially obscured by the various structures and hoardings sited on the intervening petrol filling station and would be some distance away from the proposed advertisement. However, given that the advertisement would be positioned at high level it would, by virtue of the illumination and changing images, still be a striking and incongruous feature.
8. The advertisement would not be visible from the eastern approach along the well-lit Hall Street but would be visible from St Marys Way to the west, viewed in context with the large road junction and petrol filling station. However, whilst being a dominant feature in the street scene, the petrol filling station appears to denote the end of the commercial activities in the vicinity with the character of the area beyond being residential. Furthermore, the advertisements on the petrol filling station frontage are mostly at a much lower level than the proposal.
9. The introduction of a further commercial element, at high level and in the form of an advertisement deliberately designed to attract attention by its large size and bright colours, would be an alien feature in the street scene particularly given there are no other similar displays in the locality. It would therefore be significantly harmful to the prevailing residential character of the immediate area and beyond to the east.
10. The Council states that the proposal would negatively impact upon the setting of the nearby listed building. It does not however demonstrate that it has assessed the setting of the building, explain how the setting contributes to the significance of the building, or how the proposal would harm significant aspects of the building's setting. It is therefore unclear how it has reached its view.
11. Glebe House, which is a Grade II listed building, is situated some 40m from the appeal building on the diagonally opposite side of Hall Street and remains in residential use. There are several side elevation windows that would face the proposed advertisement, partially screened by existing trees. It has attractive architectural features to its frontage including a boundary wall and gate pillars such that it makes a positive contribution to the street scene.
12. However, I consider that the significance of the setting has been substantially eroded, given the more modern features in the immediate vicinity such as the nearby St Marys Way junction and large cluttered petrol filling station directly opposite which contains multiple advertisements and levels of illumination which operate throughout the day and night. As such, whilst the proposed digital advertisement would be visible from the listed building, I find that it would not detrimentally impact the significance of its setting.
13. Overall, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would cause significant harm to amenity. Although not determinative, the advertisement conflicts with Policy SIE-1 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy SE1.3 of the UDP Review. Together these seek to secure the highest standard of design paying high regard to the built

environment and seek to avoid advertisements which form unduly dominant or intrusive elements in the street scene.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has suggested that the advertisement could be switched off every day between midnight and 7am, which could be secured by condition, but this would not mitigate the adverse impact of such an advert at all other times of the day.
15. Reference has been made by the appellant to other approvals issued by the Council for similar proposals. However, these relate to areas which are different in character. The existence of other advertisements in urban locations does not, in any event, equate to the acceptability of an advertisement in the location before me and do not lead me to an alternative conclusion.
16. I note that these types of displays may generally lead to an overall reduction in advertising sites, and a reduction in waste from poster displays; that advertising can be targeted, benefitting local businesses and emergency messaging requirements; may generate additional business rates; and that the site may be well-maintained with possible biodiversity enhancements and it could meet Smart City objectives. However, advertisements are controlled only in the interests of amenity and public safety and as such the above points make no difference to my overall conclusion.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to amenity. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR