

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	1 <sup>st</sup> October 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 19/01093/ADV	<b>Township:</b> Rochdale	<b>Ward:</b> Milkstone and Deeplish
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/20/3255566		<b>Decision level:</b> Fully Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> Car Park, Eastgate Street, Rochdale		
<b>Proposal:</b> Replacement of existing double-sided 48 sheet advertising display with a new double-sided internally illuminated 48 sheet digital advertising display - Resubmission of 19/00759/ADV		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr Steve Staley		<b>Agent:</b> Mr Tim Spottiswood
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 21 August 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The Council refused the application as the proposed illuminated, double-sided signage would cause harm to the Town Head Conservation Area (CA) and Grade II Listed St Mary’s Ukrainian Church, 20 East Gate Street and 1 to 3 Whitehall Street.</li> <li>– The Inspector noted that few buildings visible from the site contribute to the significance of the conservation area due to it mainly being concentrated around Yorkshire Street, with views into the core limited, however, St Marys Church contributes positively as a result of its scale and architecture.</li> <li>– The Inspector agreed with the council’s view that the significance of the Conservation Area had been harmed by previous poor planning decisions and that it was paramount that new developments sought to enhance the area.</li> <li>– It was considered that the illuminated nature of the signage would have been more prominent to the standing traffic on the A58 to the north, compounded by the changing of images. It was not considered that the proposed conditions to control illumination levels and the times between image changes would have reduced the harm to an acceptable level.</li> <li>– The Inspector stated that the proposal would amount to Less than Substantial harm to designated heritage assets. It was considered that the public benefits of providing information, economic contribution and reduction in vehicle usage would not outweigh the harm to heritage assets.</li> <li>– The proposed advertisement was not considered to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, and as such, since the proposed advertisement would cause visual harm to the street scene and heritage assets, the scheme would not meet the aims of the policies of the Core Strategy, the Unitary Development Plan or the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ul>		