



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/24/3342114

Land on Stockport Road and Crowcroft Road, Manchester

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by JCDecaux UK Limited against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 138638/AOH/2023, dated 23 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2024.
 - The application is for installation of internally illuminated LED Digital advertisement to replace existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the visual amenity of the local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal before me seeks express consent for an illuminated LED digital advertisement to replace an existing 96 sheet advertisement hoarding that benefits from deemed consent having been in situ for some years. The new replacement advert would measure around 6.4m by 3.5m which would be smaller than that of the existing but it would be mounted upon a higher 2.5m plinth which would result in the advertisement being raised to 6m in height.
4. The existing situation is a rather untidy triangular area of land at the junction of Stockport Road and the smaller Crowcroft Road that leads off it. Stockport Road is a main radial route into Manchester and is largely tree lined in this location. The existing paper sheet sign is horizontal and extends over nearly the full width of the plot. It also abuts the gable ends of a row of red brick terrace houses that front onto the main road here. The site itself is backed by a row of trees which considerably soften the existing appearance. Opposite the site is located a public park, Crowcroft Park. The park is slightly raised from the street level which allows views of the hoarding from within its parkland setting to such an extent as to be noticeable from vistas from within the park itself.
5. The proposal would reduce the width of the perceivable advertisement in this location by around a third. It would also establish a new plinth upon which the advert could stand which would potentially allow the site to be tidied. However,

in so doing the proposed hoarding would be raised significantly higher to such an extent that the new advertisement would be in line with the eaves of the adjacent row of terrace houses.

6. In assessing this, although I see some benefit in reducing the actual size of the current advertisement, the impact of this raising in height, to be as tall as a residential building, would lead me to conclude that there would be significant harm to the visual amenities of the area, not just when seen from Stockport Road, but also from within Crowcroft Park opposite. This impact would be made worse through the alteration of this advert to that of a digital display which would be more prominent and distracting to those residents who live nearby.
7. As such, the proposed height of this advertisement display, together with the constantly changing digital illumination would cause a noticeably more dominant and obtrusive effect upon the visual amenities of the area which would bring this proposal into conflict with policies EN1, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy as well as saved policies E3.3, DC15.1 and DC15.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester as well as the overriding policy criteria as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, taking into account the particular criteria of this proposal, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR