

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	136297/AOH/2023	
Date registered valid:	17 February 2023	
Proposal:	Installation of freestanding internally illuminated hoarding sign.	
Address:	Land Adjacent To 73 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HY	
Ward(s):	Piccadilly	Ward
Applicant:	Mr Steve Staley Vision Advertising	
Agent (if any):	Mr Tim Spottiswood	
Case officer:	Max Tel: 0161 219 Email: maximillian.gibson@manchester.gov.uk	Gibson 6359
Recommendation:	Refuse	
Date of recommendation:	28/03/2023	

Application details

Type of application: Advertisement Hoardings Consent

Development type: Advertisements

Date of site visit:

Standard consultations:

Printed: 1 March 2023 Expired: 22 March 2023

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 1 March 2023 Expired: 22 March 2023

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Grade II

Conservation area: n/a

Tree Preservation Order: n/a

Description of area

The site lies on the west side of Rochdale Road, a major arterial route into the north of Manchester city centre. Behind the site lies Victoria North, a regeneration area. New developments are currently being progressed in and around the application site as part of the implementation of the Northern Gateway Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF). Across Rochdale Road from the site is New Cross, which also form part of the SRF area and has seen rapid change and development over the last five years, transforming the area from mainly surface level car parking to a new residential led neighbourhood. The character of the area surrounding the site comprises many different uses, including dining, drinking, entertainment, office, commercial, hotels and retail. There are several designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the development site, including the Grade-II listed Marble Arch pub which is directly adjacent.

Description of development

The development relates to the installation of a new digital advertisement board. This will replace an existing, non-standard size billboard currently in place at the site. The landscape billboard will measure three metres by six metres - the standard 48-sheet measurement - surrounded by a metal frame and atop a black timber base. The total height of the structure will be six and a half metres. The digital display will be LED, with a luminance level of 300cd/m2.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity

Letters were sent to surrounding occupiers informing them of the development. One representation has been received as a result of this publicity, summarised below:

-Objection on the grounds that the development would harm visual amenity. Its location directly adjacent to a listed building detracts from its character, obscures the structure, thereby lessening its appreciation, and minimises any positive impact the listed building may have on the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area. Detracts from the character of local area and regeneration projects currently underway. Poses a risk to public safety, due to providing a screen from road that creates an area for criminal activity to take place.

Consultees

Highways - acceptable, conditions requested.

Environmental Health - acceptable, conditions requested.

Issues

Policy

The main policies that relate to this application are The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations)

The Development Plan

The Manchester Core Strategy (2012)

Relevant policies include policies DM1 (Development Management), SP1 (Spatial Principles) and EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) EN3 (Heritage) of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012),

Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995)

Relevant saved policies include DC15 (Advertisements, Hoardings and Posters), DC19 (Listed Buildings) and E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester (1995)

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 136 of the NPPF which advises that 'the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed'.

Paragraph 197 also underline the desirability for new development to make a 'positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'

Planning History

An application to illuminate an advertisement hoarding at the site was submitted in 2000 under app ref. 058685/AOH/NORTH2/00. The application was refused on the grounds that the illumination would make the billboards unduly prominent in the street scene and thereby be detrimental to visual amenity. There is no record of any other applications for advertisement

consent at the site and therefore it is believed that any hoarding currently in situ does not have consent

Two digital billboards were refused on visual amenity grounds at 110-114 Cheetham Hill Road under app. ref. 127006/AO/2020. This was subsequently appealed by the applicant. The Planning Inspectorate concurred with the decision of the Local Planning Authority and the refusal was upheld on appeal. This application is relevant to the determination of this application as follows:

The proposed digital billboards in this case were directly in the setting of a Grade-II listed building. The inspector considered that the scale, illumination, and rotating content of the display would detract from the setting of the listed building. The inspector also considered digital billboards to be more visually prominent than their non-digital counterparts and hence to create a more obtrusive feature when replacing existing non-digital signage.

The Inspector concluded that the new characteristics of the display combined with the negative impact on the setting of the listed building *'would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the locality'*.

A copy of this appeal decision is appended in full to this delegated report for information and consideration in the determination of this application.

Principle

The proposed billboard, by virtue of its scale, siting, design and position adjacent to a major radial route into Manchester city centre, would form a visually intrusive feature, harmful to the appearance of the site and wider area, as well as the setting of a Grade-II listed building. The proposal is therefore not acceptable in principle.

The main issue in the determination of this application is the effect of the proposal upon the amenity of the area and the impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed building. This is outlined further below.

Visual Amenity

An internally illuminated, non-digital billboard in situ at the development site. A search of planning records revealed no evidence that the existing billboard has received advertisement consent.

The existing billboard forms an unsightly and obtrusive feature in the street scene, which would have an unduly harmful impact on the character and visual amenity of the area. In addition, the proposed advert would detract from character and appreciation of the Grade-II listed Marble Arch Public House which it abuts.

The Marble Arch derives much of its significance from its ornate façade and chimney. It is acknowledged that the side elevation of the listed building is in a poor condition, and does not contain any historical features of significance. Nevertheless, the signage currently in place impinges on the setting and legibility of the listed building and detracts from the building's character.

The proposed billboard would have different dimensions from the existing one, being wider and shorter than the current sign. The existing sign is a non-standard display 3.9m wide by 5.9m tall, with an overall height of 9.5m including the base. The proposed billboard is 6m wide by 3m tall (standard 48no.) with a total height of 6.5m including the base. Despite this, it is considered that the proposed billboard would detract from the appreciation of the Marble Arch and its architectural features.

Advertisements, by their very nature, are designed to draw the eye. The placement of an advertisement billboard so close to a listed building would create an overly prominent feature in its setting and the existing billboard dominates views of the Marble Arch southwards from Rochdale Road, harming the legibility and appreciation of the building.

The impact on the visual amenity, character or the area and setting of the listed building is compounded by the luminance and digital nature of the display. The billboard currently in situ is internally illuminated by way conventional lighting tubes. The proposed billboard will be lit by LEDs.

The application form states that the colour and text of the billboard will be variable, meaning the digital billboard can vary content. These displays are permitted to change up to every 10 seconds, as shorter durations are prohibited on digital billboards due to potential highway safety issues.

Nevertheless, the rotation of displays can create 'movement', as noted by the inspector in their appeal decision on app. ref. 127006/AO/2020. The inspector found that this movement, combined with the greater vividness and brightness, of digital displays makes them more visually prominent than their non-digital counterparts. Likewise, it is considered the proposed billboard would be more visually prominent than that currently in situ due to the digital nature of the display.

The applicant has stated that the reduction in size between the proposed and existing billboard would reduce the advert's prominence in the street scene. However, given the digital nature of the sign, this would increase the advert's visual prominence in an unacceptable manner and harm the visual amenity of the local area and impact on the setting of the listed building. This was also a concern when the application to illuminate the billboard at the site was refused in 2000 on visual amenity grounds, as it was considered that the illumination would make the advertisement unduly prominent.

The proposed development is considered to be contrary to the provisions of EN3 of the Core Strategy which states new developments must be designed so as to support the Council in preserving or, where possible, enhancing the historic environment, saved UDP policies DC19.1 which states that development nearby a listed building should preserve or enhance its setting, DC15.1(c), which states that the council should consider the relationship a hoarding has to the premises at which they are located and DC15.2(a), which states that they should not harm the character or architectural features of a building.

The area around the application site is also the subject of significant change as part of the implementation of the SRF. Developments along main radial road routes must also be of the highest quality, as directed by policy E3.3.

The development site is in the setting of the site of a large new mixed-use development approved under app ref. 131708/FO/2021.

The visualisation provided within the supporting documents for planning application 131708/FO/2021, shows the existing billboard at the site, in the setting of the listed building and within the context of the proposed development. It is clear the existing signs forms an incongruous and obtrusive feature in the context of the new development.

It is considered that the proposed billboard would be similarly incongruous, but furthermore, by virtue of the digital display, be even more visually prominent. This would detract from the positive improvements to visual amenity created by the regeneration activity taking place in the area. This is considered to be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, in particular paragraph 197, which states that development should make positive contributions to local character.



Rochdale Road is a major arterial route into Manchester city centre. Upgrading the appearance of Manchester's arterial roads is a long-standing objective of the City Council which is reflected in saved policy E3.3 of the UDP (1995).

Public Safety

Concerns have been raised that a hoarding at the site creates an area for criminal activity to take place hidden from the road. However, this is not considered pertinent to the display of the advert itself. The proposed luminance is 300cd/m², under the 600cd/m². Highway Services have not raised any highway or pedestrians' safety concerns with regards to this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposed billboard, by virtue of its siting, digital display and illumination, will have detrimental effect on visual amenity. The illuminance and digitisation would create a more visually prominent feature in the street scene than the billboard currently in situ. In addition, the increased visual prominence and location directly adjacent to the Marble Arch Public House will create an obtrusive feature that would detract from the significance of a Grade-II listed building and neither preserve nor enhance its setting.

The area is undergoing significant regeneration and the presence of any advertisement billboard at this location would undermine improvements to visual amenity created by other developments in the area. It will also undermine the improvements being made to Manchester's arterial routes.

Other Legislative Requirements **Equality Act 2010**

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct

prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Refuse

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposed digital hoarding sign by reason of its size, appearance, position, means of illumination and method of display, would create an intrusive and incongruous feature together with having an unduly harmful impact on the character of the local street-scene along one of the City's main arterial routes (Rochdale Road). The proposal would also have an unduly harmful impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building, Marble Arch Public House, to the detriment of visual amenity. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and historic environment of the area contrary to Government Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, policies EN1, EN3, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and saved policies DC15.1, DC15.2, DC19 and E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health

69 - 71 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HU
Pgs District Office Corner Of Gould Street, Rochdale Road, Manchester, M9 5TT
Flat, The Marble Arch, 73 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HY
Apartment 604, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 603, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 4, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
87 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HY
Flat 3, 85 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HY
Apartment 506, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 507, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 602, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 513, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 601, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 512, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 509, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 511, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 510, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 508, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
67 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HU
Apartment 404, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 203, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 408, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 206, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 108, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
87A Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HY
85 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M4 4HY
Post Office Limited, Manchester CIT Depot, Admiral House, Thompson Street, Manchester, M60 0AA
Apartment 410, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 303, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 315, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 314, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 209, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 204, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 12, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 403, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 311, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 114, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 106, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 412, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 409, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 306, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 304, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 205, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 201, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 1, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 415, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 308, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 111, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW

Apartment 504, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 414, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 407, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 105, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 309, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 212, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 113, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 102, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 103, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 501, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 5, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 406, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 502, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 8, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 505, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 413, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 405, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 402, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 401, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 202, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 2, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 3, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 11, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 305, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 313, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 101, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 411, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 302, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 215, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 213, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 115, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 112, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 312, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 307, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 214, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 107, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 104, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 7, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 6, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 503, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 310, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 9, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 211, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 210, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 109, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 301, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 208, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 207, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 110, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW
Apartment 10, 6 Ludgate Hill, Manchester, M4 4BW

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

-

Appendix 3 – Planning Inspector's appeal decision app. ref. 127006/AO/2020



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/20/3257260

Land at 110-114 Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester M4 4FG

- 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 Vivid Outdoor Media Limited against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 127006/AO/2020, dated 21 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is the replacement of 2 no. existing illuminated 48-sheet advertisement displays with 2 no. illuminated 48-sheet digital advertisement displays.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Express Advertisement Consent was granted for the existing hoardings on 13 February 2007 for a period of 2 years. According to the appellant the hoardings have continued to be displayed without consent for a period of more than 10 years. Thus, it is claimed that the hoardings now benefit from Deemed Consent under the terms of Class 13 of Schedule 3 of the Regulations. Whilst it is not for me to determine the lawfulness, or otherwise, of the existing displays, the appellant has provided me with evidence of communication with the Council in this respect and I am therefore content that it was aware of the considered status at the time of reaching their decision. The Council's report indicates that it has considered the proposal as replacements for the existing hoardings. I therefore consider no party will be prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal on the same grounds.
3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the visual amenity of the locality, including the setting of St Chads Church, a Grade II listed building.

Reasons

4. The site is a corner plot at the junction of St Chad's Street with Cheetham Hill Road (A665), a busy 4-lane radial route close to the city centre ring road and linking it to outlying areas of northern Manchester. This part of Cheetham Hill Road is predominantly commercial in nature and includes mixed age buildings of varying architectural merit and scale. Consequently, the locality has a high level of signage which, for the most part, is of a more modest scale than the hoardings on the appeal site, however, other hoardings of various sizes and display type are present along the main road.
5. The proposal would retain almost identical areas of display to the existing hoardings which are capable of internal illumination. The advertisements would

rely on the same, or similar, supporting framework such that their scale and position in the streetscene would be substantially as the existing arrangement. A previous appeal decision¹ on the site found that these displays would be commensurate with the scale of their surroundings and, having visited the site, I find no reason to disagree with that assessment.

6. The significant changes would arise from the use of LED displays and a capability to regularly scroll through individual static images up to a frequency of one every 10 seconds. Although the displays would be slimmer and appear more modern than their existing counterparts, the combined effects of the generally brighter and vivid images, when taken with the 'movement' of the changing individual displays, would cause them to be more obtrusive and increase their visual prominence in comparison to the existing hoardings.
7. Whilst this effect would be tempered to a degree by controlled limitation of the brightness of the displays and, during darker hours, by the street lighting and other local sources of illumination, they would become a more intrusive element in the streetscene. This effect would occur at all times of the day but be considerably greater during darkness hours on account of the relatively exposed position on an unlit site bordered by open spaces at the sides and rear.
8. Furthermore, the proximity of the signs to the church would ensure that they feature significantly in the main views of that building and, as they are intended to do, would draw the eye. Although Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 does not apply to applications for Advertisement Consent the effect on the listed building is material to consideration of the effects of the visual amenity. The scale of the hoardings and images on display, the illumination and frequency of changing pictures would detract significantly from the setting and visual experience of the listed building.
9. In combination, I find that the effects of the new display characteristics and the impacts on the setting of the listed building would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the locality.
10. In support of the appeal the appellant refers to the acceptance of the principle of other examples of digital displays within the city supported by the Council. This includes a specific case at 143 Cheetham Hill Road. Whilst that example would lie close by, its circumstances differ in that it is a single display and is set against the backdrop of a building. Furthermore, the limited evidence provided does not suggest it lies within the close setting of a listed building. It is not therefore directly comparable to the case before me, a case I have considered on its own merits.
11. The appellant also states that the effect on the listed building remains unchanged. Notwithstanding my conclusion above, I note that the original grant of Express Consent was time limited on account that the harm identified to the setting of the listed building would be inappropriate over a longer period. In that instance, the concession to grant consent was predicated on the effects of other benefits accruing from the improvement of the wider corner site awaiting potential redevelopment. However, I find no evidence before me that the condition of the site would be prejudiced by my decision. According to the

¹ APP/B4215/H/06/1200355

appellant, the site benefits from a fallback position for the display of adverts such that continued display might occur. As such, the circumstances which were previously considered to outweigh the harm to the setting of the church attract negligible weight in this instance.

12. Moreover, the claimed lawfulness of the existing advertisements, which were anticipated to cause harm to local amenity, would not provide a sound justification to permit advertising that I have found would cause greater harm.

Other Matters

13. As a fallback position is deemed to exist there is no prejudice to the ongoing display of advertisements at the site such that the economic benefits for the site operator and owner would be diminished. Although potential environmental benefits of the proposal might accrue through reduction of waste, the use of energy and resource efficient lighting and reduced visits to the site, I do not consider that those benefits would outweigh the harm to visual amenity that would arise in the locality.

Conclusion

14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the locality due to the changes to the nature of the display and ability to successively change images.
15. I have regard to Policies EN1, EN3, SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and saved Policies DC15, DC19 and E3.3 of The Manchester Plan Unitary Development Plan 1995 as referred to by the Council and as they seek to protect amenity, together with paragraph 132 of The National Planning Policy Framework. Having found that the proposal would cause harm to local amenity, the proposal conflicts with those policies.
16. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR