Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/24/3356414
58 - 66 Market Street, Manchester, M1 1PW

- 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 Hrvoje Haramincic (Museum of Illusions Ltd) against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref is 140752/AO/2024.
- The advertisement proposed is Installation of 1no. illuminated lettering and logo sign mounted on reconstructed facade, and 1no. Alubond masked LED to building entrance.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit there were advertisements for the Museum of Illusions in place on the building. However, the fascia advertisement and door surround that have been installed do not correspond to those which are the subject of this appeal.

3. The fascia advertisement that has been installed comprises individual letters and a logo mounted on a buff-coloured rendered fascia panel. The Alubond masked LED surround includes straight illuminated lines to the entrance and is black colour.

4. The plans submitted appear to propose a single solid fascia panel which would span both main parts of the Market Street frontage cutting across the decorative central pillar and covering the protruding feature at the top of that column. The pillar designs have consistency where featured on the Market Street and Brown Street elevations of the appeal building.

5. For the avoidance of doubt, my determination has been made on the basis of the submitted plans. The Council indicate that there are no concerns with regard to public safety and I have no reason to disagree.

6. A projecting advertisement is included within the drawings but the evidence indicates that a projecting advertisement was previously approved. It is not detailed within the application form. I have not therefore considered this matter further.

Main Issue

7. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons

8. The host building is located on the corner of Market Street and Brown Street. The proposal relates to the Market Street elevation. The appeal site falls within the Upper King Street Conservation Area.

9. The buildings within this part of the Conservation Area on Market Street generally support frontages which incorporate commercial uses, primarily at ground floor level. The buildings are mixed in appearance and appear of varying ages. They do however have unity as a result of the general use of brick or stone and their similarity of scale.

10. Advertisements should be subject to control in the interests of amenity and public safety, and factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. Therefore, if the locality where an advertisement is to be displayed has important scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features, consideration should be given to whether it would be in scale and in keeping with these features.

11. Many of the buildings incorporate interesting detailing and this contributes positively to the significance of the Conservation Area forming one of the defining features of its character and appearance.

12. Although the ground floor frontages to the building may be modern, the pillars and detailing through their materials, unity of design and repetition make a positive contribution to the significance and therefore the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

13. Given that the proposed advertisement would appear as a solid panel cutting right across the detailing on the central pillar, the advertisement would obscure architectural detailing on the building. This would harm the significance and therefore the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

14. Illuminated advertisements of varying colours are common within the area and the modern Arndale Shopping Centre is located close by, which itself incorporates a wide range of illumination and colour. Therefore, there would be no adverse impact upon amenity as a result of the installation of the Alubond masked LED to the building entrance surround in Grey.

Other Matters

15. I note the wide range of advertisements on other buildings within the area and the presence of full width signage and high contrast elements which has been brought to my attention within the evidence. However, there is nothing to indicate that the other buildings incorporate identical features which have been affected in the same way. The weight I therefore afford to the presence of those other advertisements is limited.

16. I have taken into account policies SP1, CC9, EN1, EN3 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), policies DC14 and DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) (UDP) and Policy JP-P2 of the Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which amongst other things seek to protect amenity. In particular the UDP advises at DC14.5 amongst other things that signs should respect the architectural form of buildings. Given my findings above, there would be conflict with these policies.

17. However, the regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Consequently, although I have taken these policies into account, they have not been a decisive consideration in my determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

18. The advertisement would unacceptably harm visual amenity. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR