Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2009

by R. Owen-Smith BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MSocSc MBA MRTPI MIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
10 March 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/H/08/2090464
418a Wilbraham Road, Manchester M21 0SA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Primesight Limited against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref: 087303/AO/2008/S1, dated 16 July 2008, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2008.
- The advertisement proposed is the erection of 2 No. internally illuminated, single-sided, free-standing advertisement display units.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal, on amenity grounds, is the impact including the cumulative impact of the proposed units on the appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposed display units, measuring about 1.9 metres high by 1.3 metres wide would be erected side by side at the western periphery of the forecourt.

4. Due to the slightly rising gradient of the road in the vicinity of the appeal site and the absence of buildings and structures in the background, the units would feature prominently, notwithstanding nearby vegetation, in views over a considerable distance from the east. At an overall height of about 2.5 metres, the units would also be noticeable in views from the opposite direction, rising above the boundary fence and a nearby masonry wall.

5. In my opinion, the proposed units would appear as visually obtrusive in size, siting, and design and unduly assertive features in the street scene. They would add to the existing forecourt advertising signage and further accentuate the presence of advertising in an area of mixed uses. I consider that they would create an impression of general advertising clutter at the appeal site, a perception further emphasized by their illumination. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would materially harm the appearance of the street scene and would be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

6. I have had regard to all other matters raised, but find nothing of sufficient weight to alter my decision.

R. Owen-Smith

INSPECTOR