

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00962/ADV

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00962/ADV

CASE OFFICER

Sam Yuen

DETERMINATION DATE 10.12.2024 **EXT OF TIME** 04.02.2025

Address: Land At 431 Halifax Road, Rochdale, OL12 9AA

Proposal: Replacement of an existing billboard advertising display to a slim-line, internally illuminated digital display

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	N/A	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N/A
-----	--	-----

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 04/02/2025

SITE

The application relates to two small parcels of land adjacent to Halifax Road in Smallbridge. As it stands, the western end of the site comprises an existing advertisement hoarding south of no. 1 Bridge Street facing westbound traffic to the south-east. On a separate parcel of land to the north-east of the site sits two freestanding hoardings to the south of no. 2 Bridge Street with displays facing both directions of traffic. Halifax Road/A58 is a classified road and part of the strategic road network connecting Rochdale Town Centre to Littleborough.

The site lies close to multiple road junctions, including Bridge Street which separates the existing hoardings, Dye House Close to the south, and a roundabout connecting Wardle Road to the south-west. The immediate surrounding context is predominantly residential, with converted apartments (no. 431-433 Halifax Road, former Spring Mill Tavern public house) directly adjacent and a small housing development in Bridge Street.

PROPOSAL

Advertisement consent is sought for the replacement of the existing hoarding with an internally illuminated 48-sheet digital display. The siting of the proposed hoarding would be set back from the existing hoarding, against Ash Brook and the side elevation of no. 431-433 Halifax Road with an orientation towards the north-east.

The proposed display has the same dimension of 6m by 3m as the existing but would be positioned at a greater height of 2m above ground with a total height of 5.15m. It also comprises a slimmer profile of 0.25m.

It is proposed the advertisement would remain static and two-dimensional, whilst incorporating an automated 10 second sequential rotation. The illumination will adapt to ambient conditions in real time, with an output ranging between 5000cd/m² in daylight and 300cd/m² at night, in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals best practice guidance.

The submitted plans also indicate a landscaping scheme comprising shrubbery along the common boundary with no. 1 Bridge Street.

The proposed display is identical to the one of a previous submission, 20/01587/ADV, which was refused consent. However, it is noted the current application also include land which was subject to a separate application, 24/00513/ADV, that was recently granted consent. The applicant intends to not carry out the recently approved consent as part of the current proposal, and would seek to secure this by planning condition.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
T2	Improving Accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
--------------	--------------------

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

24/00513/ADV - Replacement of two freestanding advertising hoardings with 1 internally illuminated digital LED advertising display – Grant subject to conditions

20/01587/ADV - New 48-sheet digital advertising display and removal of existing 48-sheet illuminated advertising display – Refuse – Appeal Dismissed

Officer's Comments:

1. The proposed advertisement would be sited in a prominent position, directly adjacent to Halifax Road, which is a key network route and would be close to residential properties on Bridge Street. The proposed advertisement, by virtue of the digital display along with its size, scale and siting would detract from the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. The siting of the digital display would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of 1, 2 and 3 Bridge Street as it would face towards habitable room windows. The proposed advertisement is therefore contrary to Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

17/00749/ADV - Replacement of existing 1 illuminated 48 sheet advertising display with 1 internally illuminated 48 sheet digital LED advertising display – Refuse – Appeal Dismissed

Officer's Comments:

1. The proposed advertisement would be sited in a prominent position, directly adjacent to the busy highway of Halifax Road, which is part of the Key Route Network. The proposed advertisement, by virtue of the digital display along with its siting, height, size and scale would detract from the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. The LED display would constitute a bright and stark feature in this location that would detract from the character and appearance of the area. The proposed advertisement is contrary to Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Halifax Road is a busy highway and the site lies close to several junctions with a record of vehicle accidents. The proposed digital advertisement would be sited in a prominent position adjacent to the highway, which would be distracting to highway users travelling north. The proposed advertisement would present a significant distraction to motorists to the detriment of public safety, and as such is contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objections to this proposal providing the advertisement is not erected in the visibility splay of Bridge Street (2.4m x 43m).

The advertisement should cycle no more than once every 15 seconds.

The advertisement should not be erected on any Council Property without the express consent of the Local Authorities Estates Department.

Environmental Health - Noise/Odours

No comments received at the time of writing.

REPRESENTATIONS

In accordance with the Council's adopted code of practice for advertisement applications, no direct publicity was issued.

ANALYSIS

In assessing applications for advertisement consent, Paragraph 141 of the NPPF establishes that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

It is well established that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built environment. As such, with all applications for advertisements an assessment should be made as to the impacts on visual amenity and to accord with Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone and Policy P3 of

the adopted Core Strategy; signs should be compatible with the surrounding area and protect the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. In addition, Policy DM1 sets out the Council's general development requirements and establishes that proposals should not adversely impact on highway safety.

Amenity

The application seeks to replace an existing externally illuminated hoarding with an internally illuminated digital display. The same advertisement was considered in 20/01587/ADV and was refused consent, with a subsequent appeal which was dismissed by the Inspector. The appeal decision therefore forms a material consideration in the determination of this application.

The existing hoarding has an incongruous and conspicuous presence within the predominantly residential setting and does not make a positive contribution to the amenity of the area. The proposed advert would be sited in a similar position as the existing hoarding and would not appear materially greater in scale. Notwithstanding, by virtue of its size and positioning along a high-trafficked road, combined with the internally illuminated display, the proposed advert would appear more visually strident and obtrusive against the street scene than the existing hoarding.

It is notable the assessment of digital advertisement has been established in previous appeal decisions for this site, where the Inspector commented the following:

“Digital advertising is by nature and purpose more visually strident than a more traditionally illuminated hoarding. 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, despite the reduction in the overall size.”

The proposal would therefore inflict harm to the visual amenity of the area and would not be acceptable.

Owing to its siting and orientation, the proposed advert would appear more prominent from the front windows of no. 2 Bridge Street and to a lesser degree, from the rear windows of no. 1 Bridge Street. Furthermore, the illuminated display and changing images would likely intrude on the outlook of the nearest occupiers. Notwithstanding, the proposed advert would not be directly overlooked by the neighbouring properties and in the event the proposal is acceptable, conditions relating to levels of luminance and hours of operation may be utilised to ameliorate the potential residential amenity impacts.

The applicant has attached details of a recently granted advertisement consent (24/00513/ADV) at the north-western point of the site, which would be sited circa 40m to the proposed display. As part of the current proposal, the applicant intends to not carry out this approved advertisement by way of the use of planning conditions.

The extant consent comprised the installation of an internally illuminated digital display of a similar scale to the proposed advert. However, as set out in the

associated Officer's report, the amenity impact of the extant consent was judged to be neutral on the grounds the display would replace the two existing hoardings at the same location, thereby reducing the amount of advertisement on site, and would remove the hoarding which faces the residential property at no. 1 Bridge Street. In comparison, the proposed digital display would replace a single existing hoarding of a different siting which does not face any properties. As such, it is evident the proposed advert and the extant consent sit within different contexts and are not comparable; the granting of the extant consent does not assume the acceptability of the proposed advert and cannot form as a material 'fallback' position in the consideration of this application. The suggested use of planning conditions to prevent the implementation of the extant consent would also not be appropriate as it is considered the amenity harm that would arise from the proposal cannot be mitigated by the restriction of a separate development.

Public Safety

The assessment of public safety has been established in the previous submissions and associated appeal decisions. Subject to suitable conditions relating to, amongst other things, levels of luminance, advertisement cycle frequency, and restriction of moving images, the proposed advert would not be materially distracting for drivers and thus no adverse harm has been identified with regard to highway safety.

Conclusion

Taken as a whole, the proposed advertisement would inflict undue harm to the visual amenity of the surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy P3 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and Paragraph 141 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. The proposed advertisement would be sited in a prominent location, directly adjacent to Halifax Road, a high-trafficked classified road. By virtue of its size, siting and its digital display format, the proposed advertisement would appear visually strident and obtrusive against the street scene and would result in harm to the amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this consents relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan – Drawing no. 11668 | PA | 01 received 01/10/2024
- Existing Site Plan – Drawing no. 11668 | PA | 02 received 01/10/2024
- Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. 11668 | PA | 03 received 01/10/2024
- Proposed Landscaping Plan – Drawing no. 11668 | PA | 04 received 01/10/2024
- Existing and Proposed Elevations – Drawing no. 11668 | PA | 05 received 01/10/2024

Report Author Sam Yuen