The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/17/3188821
Pavement outside 1 Deansgate, Manchester M3 1AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Tom Fisher (Euro Payphone Ltd) against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 116342/TEL/2017, dated 22 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2017.
- The development proposed is prior approval for the installation of a telephone kiosk.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the installation of a telephone kiosk at pavement outside 1 Deansgate, Manchester M3 1AZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 116342/TEL/2017, dated 22 March 2017, and the plans/documents submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. In the interests of clarity and precision, the description of the development used above has been taken from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice.

3. Whilst certain deemed consent rights exist for the display of advertisements on telephone kiosks, or express consent may be sought for such, this appeal relates solely to the installation of a telephone kiosk.

4. The Council's Decision Notice refers to the appeal site being located adjacent to the Parsonage Gardens Conservation Area. However, the Conservation Area Boundary Map provided by the Council defines the Conservation Area as being Parsonage Road. I have no other evidence to suggest the existence of the Parsonage Gardens Conservation Area. I have therefore used the title of the Parsonage Road Conservation Area in this appeal as shown on the Boundary Map.

5. As an electronic communications code operator, the appellant benefits from deemed planning permission for a proposed telephone kiosk under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (GPDO), subject to prior approval by the local

planning authority of siting and appearance. The provisions of the GPDO require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely upon the basis of its siting and appearance, taking into account any representations received. The appellant applied to the Council on that basis.

6. As the principle of development is established, considerations such as need for the telephone kiosk are not a relevant matter. The Council determined that prior approval was required and refused. Accordingly the main issues are as below.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- The effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk on the character and appearance of the surrounding area bearing in mind its location adjacent to the Cathedral Conservation Area, Parsonage Road Conservation Area and St Anns Square Conservation Area.
- The effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk on highway and pedestrian safety.
- Whether the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk would cause an increase in crime and disorder in the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site is on the relatively wide pavement of a busy commercial thoroughfare in the town centre of Manchester and this part of Deansgate is relatively uncluttered by street furniture. Adjacent buildings to the west and east, comprising a hotel and retail/commercial property, are relatively modern and have substantial scale, mass and height with the retail frontage having high glazing panels. The appellant indicates that the Cathedral Conservation Area is located approximately 70m to the north of the site and that the Parsonage Road and St Anns Conservation Areas are approximately 80m to the south of the site.

9. The proposed kiosk would be metal framed with extensive glazing panels and would be open sided to facilitate access for wheelchair users. It would have a simple, modern, lightweight design. It would be sited approximately 0.6m from the kerb edge and would be aligned with the position of existing street furniture in terms of its relationship with the road. The appellant indicates that the proposed position of the kiosk would enable approximately 6.88m of unobstructed footway to remain following its installation.

10. The contemporary appearance of the kiosk would not be out of kilter with the modern commercial character of its surroundings. Given the width of the street and the scale of adjacent buildings the design and placement of the kiosk would assimilate with its surroundings, would not appear prominent and would not deplete the spacious character of the surrounding streetscene to any material degree.

11. Whilst the proposed kiosk would undoubtedly add to the amount of structures in the area, there would be considerable separation distances between it and the adjacent street paraphernalia and the building on the eastern side of the

street. This spacing combined with its lightweight appearance would avoid the impression of adding harmful clutter to the area.

12. The proposed kiosk would be inter-visible to some degree with the Conservation Areas mentioned. However, I have found that the proposed kiosk would assimilate with its surroundings, would be aligned with existing street furniture and would have adequate separation distance to the Conservation Area boundaries. In addition, given the small scale nature of the proposed kiosk in the context of the width of the street and the scale of adjacent buildings, views from within or towards the Conservations Areas from the street would not be materially altered. These factors lead me to conclude that the proposal would cause no harm to the character, appearance or significance of any of the Conservation Areas mentioned.

13. Taking into account the above factors, the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk would cause no material harm to the character and appearance of its surroundings. Neither would the proposed development harm the significance or setting of the adjacent Conservation Areas and would thus preserve their character and appearance. Consequently, the proposal would accord with design, appearance and conservation aims of Policies DM1, EN1, EN3, CC9 of the Manchester Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 (Core Strategy) and Saved Policies E3.3, DC17.1 and DC18.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP).

14. Although the Council also suggests that the proposal would conflict with Saved Policy DC19.1 of the UDP, this policy relates to development that may have an impact on Listed Buildings. I have no evidence in this case that would suggest that the proposed development is within the setting of a Listed Building or would affect a such setting. Consequently, I have attached no weight to the provisions of this policy in the consideration of this appeal.

Highway and pedestrian safety

15. In considering the width of unobstructed footway that should be maintained in new development for the installation of structures on the street, the appellant has referred to the guidance provided in the Department for Transport's 'Manual for Streets (2007)' and the 'Inclusive Mobility (2005)' documents. These require a minimum unobstructed footway width of a least 2m to remain. In addition, the Council's 'Design for Access 2 (2003)' document suggests that there should be a minimum of 1.8m of footway clear of obstructions and that street furniture should be placed a minimum of 0.45m from the kerb face with the road.

16. The proposed position of the kiosk would meet the requirements of these guidance documents with an unobstructed footway width of 6.88m remaining between the kiosk and the adjacent building. In being in line with existing street furniture it would not cause any obstruction to pedestrian flows. In any event, I observed that pedestrians here generally walk closer to the building frontages. I consider it unlikely that many would walk along close to the edge of the kerb (including those with visual impairments) as this part of the footway is already obstructed by the adjacent street lighting columns and other street furniture. As such, pedestrian movement would not be compromised by the siting of the proposed kiosk.

17. The horizontal and vertical alignment of Deansgate is relatively straight and flat with good highway and pedestrian visibility and inter-visibility. As the proposed kiosk is a relatively small structure and taking into account its proposed position in being aligned with the existing street furniture and being set back form the kerb edge in accordance with the Council's 'Design for Access 2' document, the proposal would not result in any significant deterioration in visibility for any road users.

18. Taking the above factors into account, I conclude that the proposed siting of the kiosk would not significantly harm highway and pedestrian safety and nor would it cause any material inconvenience for highway users. As such, there would be no conflict with Policies CC4, CC10, DM1, EN1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy or Saved Policy E3.3 of the UDP. These policies, amongst other things, require development to take road safety into consideration and maintain a high standard of accessibility across all spaces.

Crime and disorder

19. The GDPO and the National Planning Policy Framework establish that, in planning terms, payphones are, in principle, an acceptable form of development. Insofar as the Council's concerns regarding a potential increase in anti-social behaviour, flyposting and resulting in an increase in crime and disorder, I have little evidence before me as to how the proposed kiosk would cause such impacts.

20. The proposed location would be open to wide public surveillance. The design of the proposed kiosk with open sides and glass panels would also provide for natural surveillance within the kiosk itself. Whilst I accept that fly posting could occur, I observed at my site visit that a similar designed kiosk located relatively close to the appeal site near the junction of St Mary's Gate and Deansgate did not display any evidence of vandalism or fly postings. As such, I have little evidence to suggest that such concerns are a problem in the area. Furthermore, I note that Greater Manchester Police did not specifically object to the proposed siting of the kiosk.

21. Taking the above factors into account, I am satisfied the proposed kiosk would perform a public function and I have no demonstrable evidence to suggest that its proposed siting would cause an increase in crime and disorder in the area. Although, some of the policies of the development plan that the Council has referred to have tenuous links to matters of crime and disorder, I do not consider that there would be any conflict with Policies CC4, CC10, DM1, EN1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy or Saved Policy E3.3 of the UDP. These policies, amongst other things, require development proposals to take into account community safety and crime prevention and contribute to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents. In addition, and for the same reasons, I do not consider that there would be any conflict with Policy 8 of the Council's 'Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance 2007' document.

22. The Council has referred to a conflict with Policy T1 of the Core Strategy with regard to the effect of the development on crime and disorder. However, the requirements of this policy relate to sustainable transport and in my view has little relevance, if any, to the Council's concerns regarding crime and disorder. Consequently, I have attached minimal weight to the requirements of this policy in the consideration of this issue.

Other matters

23. I have taken into account the Council's concern that the proposal would have a negative effect upon regeneration efforts and improvements to the environment taking place within the area. However, there is no substantive evidence before me regarding any detailed proposals or the effect that these may have on the appeal site. Consequently, I have attached minimal weight to this matter and I have determined the appeal within the parameters of the GPDO.

24. I have also taken into account the concerns of an interested party who consider that the motivation for such applications for prior approval is to develop a ubiquitous network of advertising panels. This appeal relates solely to the installation of a telephone kiosk and does not provide for any advertisement consent pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, as amended. As such, I attach little weight to these concerns.

Conditions

25. The Council has not suggested any other conditions in addition to the standard condition set out in Schedule 2, Part 16, paragraph A.2 of the GPDO and I consider that no additional conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

26. For the above reasons, and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR