



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by **Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/H/25/3365361

Unit 3, Manchester Fort Shopping Park, Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester M8 8EP

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Phil Dixon Haymes (Pets at Home) against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 142018/AO/2025.
 - The advertisement proposed is 10 off printed glazing vinyls, 4 off non illuminated panels, 1 off non illuminated panel and 2 off non illuminated Poster frames.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 10 off printed glazing vinyls, 4 off non illuminated panels, 1 off non illuminated panel and 2 off non illuminated poster frames at Unit 3, Manchester Fort Shopping Park, Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester M8 8EP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 142018/AO/2025. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application subject to this appeal sought consent for several advertisements. The Council granted express consent for a fascia sign and projecting sign. The Council expressly refused the vinyl signs, described as “10 off printed glazing vinyls” in the description above. The Council did not specify granting express consent for the totem signage, and ‘Item I’ signage does not appear to have been considered. Therefore, I have considered all remaining advertisements that were submitted for assessment as the appeal follows an application for express consent for the above signage.
3. The Council raise no issues in relation to public safety and I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements on amenity.

Reasons

5. The site is located on a large retail park, where advertisements are common place and in various forms, such as large fascias, totem signs, banners, vinyls and projecting hanging signs. The proposed vinyl signs are located at ground floor level and cover up existing shop windows. Those to either side of the main

entrance are opaque and those on the main entrance doors are transparent enabling views through into the shop. The transparent panels adds visual interest to the façade and they have an acceptable effect on amenity.

6. The opaque vinyl panels are commonplace in many retail parks, and there are indeed examples on this park. Whilst they cover up the glazing, and this removes the retail activity of a shop front, behind these panels are shelving units. Therefore, there is no traditional retail activity taking place and the backside of shelving units would not create an appealing frontage.
7. The advertising panels would ensure that the store front is visually interesting. Additionally, their scale and location would not result in clutter, having regard to the general characteristics of the locality and other surrounding advertisements. A retail park is a specific context where a greater number of advertisements is typically expected. The other advertisements which are sought consent for would also have an acceptable effect on the amenity of the area.
8. Consequently, the advertisements would have an acceptable effect upon amenity. I have considered Policy DC14 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan (July 1995) and Policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 of the Strategy for the City of Manchester (July 2012, updated March 2024) and the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, in so far as they refer to amenity, and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity; the proposal does not conflict with these policies.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR