Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2008

by Keith Manning BSc (Hons) BTP MRTPI

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:
28 January 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/H/08/2086245
Land adjacent to Rochdale Canal, Hulme Hall Lane, Miles Platting, Manchester M40 8AZ

- 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 British Waterways against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 086849/AOH/2008/N1, dated 22 May 2008, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2008.
- The advertisement proposed is one internally illuminated P200 advertising unit, measuring 6.3m X 3.3m.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. The effects of the proposed advertisement on the character and appearance of the area and on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The Council refers to a number of saved policies of the City of Manchester Unitary Development Plan. The Regulations require that decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and, where applicable, public safety. Therefore these policies alone cannot be decisive. But I have taken them into account as material considerations in my determination of the appeal.

4. The application is for a single-sided display facing south-east and elevated above the canal so as to be visible from the road which at this location is a dual-carriageway and a significant transport route. Notwithstanding that the area is predominantly industrial at this point, the roadside environment is largely free of advertisement hoardings. The proposed advertisement would be to the north-east of Hulme Hall Lane and effectively above the visible crest of the road which has a gentle gradient to cross the canal. A short distance to the south-east of this is a busy signal-controlled junction with Lord North Street.

5. Although the road is fringed by industry, it appears spacious and relatively well graced by the presence of trees and within this context the proposed advertisement would appear prominent and to some extent incongruous projecting above the bridge, notwithstanding the relatively large buildings nearby. Moreover, bearing in mind the advice of PPG19, there is no need to screen an eyesore or add colour or interest at this particular location.

6. For these reasons, I consider that the proposed advertisement would appear as an isolated and unduly dominant feature and therefore detrimental to the interests of amenity with no benefits to outweigh the harm.

7. I would not consider the proposed advertisement to be unduly distracting to users of the highway but, having approached the signal-controlled junction from the south-east both on foot and by car, in the latter case specifically to perform the right-turning manoeuvre into Lord North Street, I am not satisfied that the signal head positioned at its northeast corner would not be backgrounded by the proposed advertisement. This could significantly reduce the clarity of the signal, thereby harming highway safety.

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity and public safety.

Keith Manning

Inspector