

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	7 October 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for Economy and Communications
Report Author	Majid Mir
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 20/01587/ADV	Township: Pennines	Ward: Smallbridge Firgrove
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/Z/21/3276295		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: Land At 431 Halifax Road, Rochdale, OL12 9AA		
Proposal: New 48-sheet digital advertising display and removal of existing 48-sheet illuminated advertising display		
Applicant: Mr Richard Page		Agent: n/a
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 2nd September 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main issue was the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity. – The inspector noted that the proposal would be apparent in an area that is surrounded by residential properties. The inspector considered that the proposed advert would appear out of place within the wider area with the presence of the proposed landscaping providing only some visual obstruction to those living closest to the advertisement. – The inspector did not consider the presence of other advertising in the area or the removal of existing advertisement on the site would ameliorate the impact or justify the proposal as their impact is less apparent. – The inspector concluded that digital advertising is by nature and purpose more visually strident than a more traditionally illuminated hoarding. The inspector added, that regardless of the setting of the sequential display and the absence of special effects, the proposal would harm the visual amenity of the area. The attention that would be drawn to the advertisement would make it more apparent. – The Council considered that the advertisement would harm the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties. However, the inspector observed that the location of the proposed advert was not directly overlooked from any of the nearby residential properties and if the appeal was allowed, the effect on living conditions could be made acceptable through conditions relating to levels of luminance and hours of operation. – The inspector took into consideration the standard conditions that could be created to mitigate the impact, but the inspector considered that they would not overcome the harm that had been identified. – The appeal was dismissed as the inspector believed the proposal harm the amenity of the local area contrary to paragraphs 127 and 132 of the NPPF and Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. 		