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/08/2085800
Land adjacent to Canal, Ashton New Road, Manchester M11

- 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 086850/AOH/2008/N2, dated 22 May 2008, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2008.
- The advertisement proposed is one, single sided, internally illuminated P200 advertising unit, measuring 6.3m X 3.3m.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The effect of the proposed advertisement on the character and appearance of the area.

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 appeal site lies on the fringes of a commercial area of shops and offices along Ashton New Road, a major transport route along which I observed steady pedestrian flows in this locality, but the nature of the nearby office buildings lends a more civic ambience to its immediate surroundings. Moreover, the view of the proposed advertisement from the east would be against the backdrop, albeit at some distance and with intervening trees, of the new stadium and a significant work of public art in an area that has undergone significant regeneration. In that context it would appear unrelated to any structure or building and as a large and intrusive feature dominating the highway, particularly the adjacent pavement, in the vicinity of the canal bridge.

5. Although I do not consider that the enjoyment of the canal side route would be unduly harmed by the proposed advertisement, which would be elevated for visibility from the road and to clear not only the bridge parapet but also the high fencing around the adjacent parking area, that elevation would serve to increase its visual dominance and intrusion within the street scene.

6. Bearing in mind the advice of PPG19 concerning the need for free-standing roadside displays to avoid a dominant visual impact on their surroundings and an overwhelming effect on pedestrians, and my conclusions regarding the appearance in context of the advertisement proposed in this instance and its dominance of the roadside environment, I consider that its effect on amenity would, overall, be a negative one.

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Keith Manning

Inspector