

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: 21/00014/ADV	Township: Rochdale	Ward: Spotland and Falinge
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/Z/21/3274356		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: Land On The North East Side Of Mellor Street Rochdale, OL12 6AA		
Proposal: Upgrade of existing 48 sheet advert to support digital poster		
Applicant: Wildstone Estates Limited		Agent: Georgia Crowley
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 13 September 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main issues with the proposed development was the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area. – The site is located within the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area and adjacent Grade II Listed Mellor Street Bridges. – The inspector concluded that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. They noted that the proposed advert would be experienced when entering the Conservation Area and whilst the area is defined by a predominantly commercial character with industrial units and signage, the inspector believed adverts of the nature proposed are not a characteristic of that section of the Conservation Area or the surroundings. – The inspector concluded that the proposed advert would be harmful to visual amenity and the setting of the bridges. Though the statutory duty to have special regard to preserving a listed building or its setting does not apply to applications for advertisement consent, the inspector considered that the bridges contribute positively to the character of the area, and in particular to the entrance to the Conservation Area. The inspector considered the digital display would appear overtly modern in comparison. Its illumination and elevated position in comparison with the existing would visually compete with the bridges, detracting from their character and drawing attention away from them to a greater degree than the existing advert. – In regards to the size and illumination, the inspector noted that it would be notably larger than many of the unit signage examples but the scale would match nearby adverts. However, the internal illumination would add more prominence than the external lighting at these displays. The inspector also considered that the illumination of the street lighting provides is substantially different to that which would have been introduced by the scale of the proposed advert. – The appellant did highlight benefits of the proposal, however, the inspector believed the benefits were limited and did not attract sufficient weight to outweigh the harm identified. 		

- The inspector also dismissed suggestions for conditions to ensure that the sequencing, luminance and nature of the images displayed would be in line with industry standard as they considered that the measures would not be sufficient to avoid the harm to visual amenity identified.
- The appeal was dismissed as the inspector believed the proposal would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area and therefore conflict with Policies P2 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy BE/17 of the UDP, as well as the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to promote good design.