
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/Z/25/3374774

Brightgate House, 1 Brightgate Way, Trafford Park, Trafford M32 0TB

- 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. Jon Crouch of Seneca Property against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 116747/ADV/25.
 - The advertisement proposed is for the installation of 2 no. internally illuminated digital advertisement boards.
-

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 and Main Issue

3. I have taken cited development plan policies into account as material considerations, since the power to control advertisements may be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety only. They have not been decisive. The Council does not have concerns regarding public safety. I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, my recommendation focuses on the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity which is the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site consists of a section of grass verge to the front of Brightgate House. It is part of a large industrial estate which is formed of large scale office, commercial, and industrial buildings. It is adjacent Barton Dock Road, a well-trafficked B-road through Trafford Park. The road has a spacious and leafy quality that positively contributes to its character. This is achieved through the wide and level footways and the setback of buildings away from the carriageway, behind continuous lines of mature trees, planting, grass verges and street lighting. These features also allow uninterrupted, long range eye level views.
5. The Planning Guidelines (PG) suggest that, in Trafford Park, development may consist of large scale buildings such that large hoardings would not necessarily be out of scale. However, the PG offers guidance only and further advises that badly located and designed hoardings can still harm the appearance of such an area.

6. The proposals would be sited along a flat and open stretch of road, where they would appear prominent to passing motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. Whilst they would be set back from the carriageway and viewed in sequence, their considerable scale and large rectangular form would result in their pronounced and dominating presence. Together with their proposed illumination and digital screens, they would have an isolated and visually striking appearance which would detract from the surrounding greenery. Furthermore, given their siting, scale, design, and illumination, they would disrupt the pleasant, uninterrupted views along the road and introduce discordant elements into the streetscape.
7. Barton Dock Road contains some large scale buildings. However, the nearest structures lie behind the appeal site and are limited to two storeys. These are also set well back and separated by fencing, trees, and planting along the boundary. Therefore, even with these buildings in the background, the appeal scheme would still appear as substantial and imposing additions, especially given their positioning much further forward of these. Advertisements are common within the wider industrial estate, and some signs do exist in the immediate vicinity. However, these are generally non-illuminated and located on the facades of existing buildings or within the boundaries of the commercial or industrial premises.
8. With this and the above in mind, the scheme would be harmful to the amenity of the area, failing to comply with the regulations. It would be contrary to the aims of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024, as far as they are material. This policy seeks for, amongst other things, all developments to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality.

Other Matters

9. I have not been provided with details of the other cited planning approvals and refusals. Therefore, I cannot be sure that they represent a sufficient comparison to the appeal scheme, such that they suitably alter the specifics of the appeal site's context and change my findings. In any case, they appear to relate to much larger signs within a different site context. Any alleged inconsistent decision making from the Council should be taken up with them directly and is not for me to resolve here.
10. The economic and regeneration benefits put forward by the appellant from two digital displays would be modest. As such, and putting aside the limitations of what can be considered under the regulations, they carry only very limited weight and would be, should they be relevant, insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. The proposed advertisements would incorporate industry standard controls for brightness, content, design and access. However, these would not satisfactorily overcome the concerns I have set out, which extend to wider matters.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Due to the harm I have found to amenity, the proposed advertisement would not be acceptable under the aforementioned regulations. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR