



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2026

by **D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 MARCH 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/G/25/3366262

332-334 Chester Road, Stretford, Manchester, M16 9EZ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a Discontinuance Notice relating to the display of advertisements with deemed consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Outdoor Advertising A Limited against discontinuance action by Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The Council reference is 24/00325/ADVERT.
 - The Discontinuance Notice is dated 8 April 2025.
 - The advertisements concerned (including the display structures and any fitments and associated apparatus) are shown outlined in red on the attached photograph ENF01, sited at 332-340 Chester Road, Manchester, M16 9EZ, shown edged red on the attached plan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed. I direct that the Discontinuance Notice shall come back into effect immediately and the use of the site for the display of the advertisements with deemed consent shall cease by the end of one month from the date of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. Regulation 8(1) of the advertisement regulations states that a discontinuance notice (DN) may only be served where the planning authority is satisfied that the removal of the advertisement is necessary to remedy a 'substantial injury' to the amenity of the locality or a danger to members of the public. Regulation 8(8) of the advertisement regulations states that in considering whether to serve a DN, the local planning authority shall have regard to any material change in circumstances that has occurred.
3. The Council has referred to a dismissed discontinuance notice appeal decision¹ relating to an advertisement close to the appeal site and on the gable elevation of No. 328 Chester Road. The removal of that advertisement is of relevance in terms of the resultant character and appearance of the area. However, it has been necessary for me to determine this discontinuance notice appeal on its individual merits and in the context of whether the advertisements are causing substantial injury to the amenity of the area.

Main Issue

4. There is no dispute between the main parties that the advertisements are not causing a danger to members of the public. The main issue is whether the

¹ Appeal reference APP/Q4245/G/25/3359322

continued use of the site for the display of the advertisements would cause substantial injury to the amenity of the locality.

Reasons

5. The advertisements which are the subject of this appeal are 2 x 48-sheet (6m x 3m) paper and paste externally illuminated advertising billboards. The appeal property is positioned within the Empress Conservation Area (CA), the special interest of which stems from the surviving historic sections which convey the story of the area's industrial development and in particular the three distinct building types which reflect their use and purpose: residential, industrial and office.
6. The advertisements are located adjacent to Nos. 328 and 330 Chester Road which the Empress Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document Conservation Area Management Plan 2016 (CAMP) identifies as positive contributors within the CA. This is because they retain several original features and classical proportions and are good examples of the much-lost terraced housing which was prevalent in the area. To the other side of the appeal site is a vacant single storey industrial building and, beyond that, are the more traditional and architecturally pleasing brick-built terraces known as Birkdale Terrace and Chester Terrace.
7. The immediate area is characterised as being of mixed-use character. There is a relatively recently constructed new high-rise brick-built apartment building (Botanica Apartments) on the other side of the main road, and which I find has positively changed the character and appearance of the area. New cycling infrastructure is in place in Chester Road. To the north of the appeal site and beyond Nos. 328 and 330 Chester Road, there is a modern BMW garage which is constructed from a silver clad material. Advertisements and other signage in the surrounding area are limited in scale and extent.
8. It is noteworthy that the CAMP states that *'although a significant proportion of the Conservation Area's character and historic interest stems from its early commercial activity, the continued presence of large-scale modern hoardings should not be permitted. These are highly detracting features and not suitable within a Conservation Area'*.
9. As part of my site visit, I was able to consider the advertisements in their wider environmental context, including the relationship with recent regeneration efforts that have taken place in the locality. I find that the two advertisements appear as disproportionately large and jarring additions when experienced by passers-by in Chester Road and this part of the CA. They unacceptably visually compete with the traditional character and proportions of Nos. 328 and 330 Chester Road and fail to assimilate well with the scale and the traditional architectural splendour of the other terraces to the south. It could not on any reasonable or objective basis be said that the advertisements are experienced as being ancillary or subservient in scale when seen against Nos. 328 and 330 Chester Road. Indeed, they are experienced as being prominent, unsightly and disproportionate additions in this part of Chester Road.
10. Moreover, it is evident that the area has changed significantly from when the advertisements were first erected. I do not agree with the appellant that the multi-storey apartment building opposite the site has caused harm to the CA owing to its scale or appearance. There is a very visible difference between one side of Chester Road and the other and, in this regard, the scale and appearance of the

relatively newly built multi-storey apartment building is appropriate and sympathetic in design terms. I find that it has made a positive contribution to the significance of the CA from the point of view of its setting. For those living in or leaving Botanica Apartments, the advertisements are seen by residents as being discordant, disproportionate and jarring additions in the urban landscape. This is particularly the case when seen alongside the proportions and traditional features of Nos. 328 and 330 Chester Road.

11. I note the appellant's claim that the advertisements screen the '*unsightly industrial and commercial development to the rear*'. The land immediately to the rear of the advertisements does not include any buildings. It is open and the buildings beyond it are set well back from Chester Road. I also note the comment made by the Council that the site has long been identified as a potential development site and, in the context of regeneration efforts that have been undertaken so far in the locality, I find that the removal of the advertisements would more likely than not have the potential for land to the rear of the advertisements to be sensitively redeveloped in time (even if the appellant were to still own or control such land), thereby further improving the visual amenity of the locality as a whole.
12. It is noteworthy that the CAMP shows the land to the rear of the advertisements as '*potential for enhancement*'. In this case, I do not find that the claimed screening effect provided by the advertisements justifies the continued retention of the advertisements. Any claimed screening effects does not alter or outweigh the other substantial injury to visual amenity that I have identified that has been caused to the locality.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the advertisements do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Overall, they cause substantial injury to the amenity of the locality. Hence, they should be removed.

Conclusion

14. Having regard to all of the above, I conclude that the advertisements cause substantial injury to the amenity of the locality contrary to the criteria set out in Regulation 8. Consequently, the appeal should fail.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR