
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026 by S Manson DipTP MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/Z/25/3375924

Cavendish House, Cross Street, Trafford, Sale M33 7BU

- 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 Orbit Investments (Properties) Limited against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 116490/ADV/25.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as “re-erect billboard advertisement.”
-

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 Matters and Main Issue

3. The above mentioned regulations set out that powers thereunder shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material. The Council has no objections to the scheme on public safety, and I have no reason to disagree. I have therefore focussed on the main issue, which is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site occupies a prominent position on the eastern side of Cross Street, a classified road with a constant flow of traffic. The proposal would be sited at the vehicular entrance to the Cavendish House car park. It'd be obvious on the approach from the south-west. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial, including large office buildings and a petrol filling station.
5. While there are some smaller advertisements along the road and within the central reservation, they are limited in number and modest in scale. They are not a defining characteristic of the street scene. To the rear of the site lies the Crossford Bridge Playing Fields, a predominantly open green area with mature boundary trees. This landscaped edge softens the otherwise hard streetscape of the classified road and makes a positive contribution to the visual qualities of this urban fringe location.
6. By reason of its size and height above the existing brick wall, the proposed billboard would read as a large and assertive structure in a sensitive location that

benefits from the softening effect of established landscaping. Its considerable scale would dominate the immediate frontage and compete visually with the mature trees and green backdrop, eroding the quality of the contribution that it makes to the street scene. The bulk and extent of the display would be out of keeping with the pattern, scale, and frequency of advertisements in the vicinity. In public views, the proposal would be intrusive and introduce a conspicuous element that would fail to respect the established character of the area.

7. The scheme would fail to align with the aims, as far as they are material, of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2022 to 2039 (2024). This sets out, amongst other things, that development should respect and acknowledge the character and identity of a location.
8. It would appear the previous billboard style advertisement on the site was displayed without the benefit of advertisement consent. Whilst the appellant has argued that the advertisement had deemed consent, it has since been removed. Its former presence does not establish a precedent or diminish the need to safeguard amenity in accordance with the advertisement control regime. Moreover, the removal of the previous structure has revealed the landscaped boundary more clearly, and the proposal would reverse that benefit. I have considered whether any conditions, for example, a soft landscaping scheme would mitigate the identified harm. However, given the fundamental issue of scale and siting, such would not overcome the proposal's adverse visual effects.

Other Matters

9. An illuminated totem style sign is typical of, and expected in, that commercial context, forming part of the functional identity of a filling station. Such circumstances are therefore materially different to the appeal proposal, which involves a large billboard in a more open and landscaped setting. That example does not provide a meaningful comparison or justify granting consent in this case. Similarly, the photographs of various signage in the vicinity of the appeal site show significantly smaller advertisements typical in an urban setting. These examples do not have the same visual impact as the proposals and do not justify the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed advertisement would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to the Regulations. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR