

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134927/AOH/2022
Date registered valid: 28 October 2022
Proposal: Continued display of 17m x 16 m temporary externally illuminated advertising banner (upvc material) on scaffold for temporary period commencing 01 September 2022 to 31 March 2023
Address: 33-35 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
Ward(s): Piccadilly Ward

Applicant: Mark Wilkinson Infinity Outdoor 1st Floor, 44 Charlotte Street, London, W1T 2NR
Agent (if any):
Case officer: Angela Leckie
Tel: 0161 234 4651
Email: angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 07-12-2022

Application details

Type of application: Advertisement Hoardings Consent

Development type: Advertisements

Date of site visit: 11-11-22

Standard consultations:

Printed: 6 December 2022 Expired: 27 December 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 November 2022 Expired: 2 December 2022

Site notice

Posted: 11 November 2022 Expired: 2 December 2022

Press advert

Published: 15 November 2022 Expired: 6 December 2022

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The application relates to a building known as 33-35 Piccadilly originally designed as a bank building in the 1930's. The building has elevations onto Piccadilly and Back Piccadilly and comprises 6 storeys on its frontage to Piccadilly above a basement, stepping back to 4 storeys on Back Piccadilly.

Although 33-35 Piccadilly is not listed it is still seen as a significant landmark within the gardens themselves and the Stevenson Square Conservation Area to the North and East. Adjacent to the building is a Travelodge with ground floor commercial uses this is located within an extended late 1920's building which replaced the former Albion Hotel building built in 1888.

The building lies adjacent to the grade II listed 17 and 47 Piccadilly.

The building is understood to have been designed by local architect Murgatroyd. The building was originally designed for the Manchester and Salford Bank. Aerial photographs of Piccadilly Gardens taken in 1933 suggest that the back two thirds of the building were reconfigured at a later date. The design and appearance of the buff brick clad light well and Back Piccadilly Elevations do suggest this part of the building was a much later addition.

The original 1930's facade facing Piccadilly Gardens is faced in Portland Stone. The original façade is largely intact on the upper levels and has numerous decorative features including a row of lion sculptures along its main facade. The building could be considered to be a non designated heritage asset given its history and the level of architectural detailing to its front façade.

Although during the past 14 months officers have on occasions witnessed contractors working on the fit out of the ground floor of the building. No works have taken place on the upper floors. There is no scaffolding to the rear of the site.

Description of area

The application site lies on the edge of an area of the City Centre known as the Northern Quarter which contains a variety of uses including bars, restaurants, commercial, residential, hotel uses and places of worship. The site also lies close to the major transport hubs of Piccadilly Train station and the Bus and Tram stops at Parker Street within Piccadilly Gardens.

Description of Development

Consent is sought for the continued display of 17m x 16 m temporary externally illuminated advertising banner (upvc material) on scaffold for temporary period commencing 01 September 2022 to 31 March 2023.

A previous temporary consent application ref no 129362/AO/2021 granted for consent from 01-07-21 and 30-01-22. This was accepted on the following basis:

Hoardings of the nature proposed are generally acceptable only if they are associated with legitimate works to a site or building. The rationale being that the temporary banners will give the building a more attractive appearance within the street scene than the scaffolding alone would. At the time of the approval the applicant had provided evidence to demonstrate that development is taking place on the site supplying a Schedule of Works and a signed Contract for the works. In that context it was considered that the proposed hoarding would relate to legitimate works and

would relate properly to the site on which it would stand. It was considered that the banner would mitigate the visual effect of the unsightly scaffold which would facilitate works during the construction period.

It was acknowledged that the advertisement would affect the setting and character of the Stevenson Square Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings at 17 and 47 Piccadilly. It was noted that the building would be mostly covered by a shroud, with or without the installation of the proposed advertisement. The proposed scaffold wrap would cause less than significant harm to the character and appearance the Stevenson Square Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings due to its intrusive albeit temporary appearance, which is emphasised by the illumination of the advertisement. The advertisements displayed would also be substantially different to a plain shroud.

The harm was justified by the temporary nature of the works and the funding that this would generate to improve the condition and future structural integrity of a building which lies within a conservation area and affects the setting of the above listed buildings.

As such on a temporary 6 month basis the location of the proposed advertisement and its impact upon visual amenity and the heritage assets was considered to be acceptable.

The 6 month consent expired on 30.01.2022. It is noted that although no consent was in place the display approved in 2021 has continued to be displayed with the exception of intermittent periods when the advert has been changed. Therefore the advert has now been in place for approximately 14 months, 8 months more than originally permitted. A further consent as sought would take this to 19 months.

The current application is supported by a Schedule of Repair Works and Programme. Under this the works were due to commence week commencing 07-12-22. No Contract signed or otherwise has been provided with the application and as detailed below officers have not witnessed any activity on site to suggest that the works have commenced in accordance with the above Programme.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity – The application was advertised as affecting a conservation area and the setting of a listed building and occupiers of adjacent buildings were notified about the proposals. As site notice was also displayed adjacent to the site.

No representations have been received.

Highways Services – Have no highway safety objections.

Environmental Health – Have no objections subject to lux levels being set at 300cd/m²

Issues

Relevant National Policy

The revised NPPF re-issued in February 2021 states that the ‘purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The document clarifies that the ‘objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (paragraph 7). In order to achieve sustainable development, the planning system has three overarching objectives – economic, social and environmental (paragraph 8).

The following sections of the National Planning Policy Framework are of relevance to this application:

Section 12 (Requiring Good Design) states that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment. Control over outdoor advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Only those advertisements which will clearly have an appreciable impact on a building or on their surroundings should be subject to the local planning authority's detailed assessment. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

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

The proposed advertisement is considered to have been poorly placed having no relation to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the scale and design of surrounding buildings. The shroud also entirely masks the front elevation of a non designated heritage asset and its decorative features, ridge line and roofscape.

This is discussed in more detail later in this Report.

Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment – which states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

And that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

It is a fundamental requirement of the NPPF that planning proposals contribute to the achievement of "sustainable development" (NPPF Paragraph 8). In order to meet this key planning objective, in this instance the development should sustain and contribute to the stimulation of a thriving historic environment. Section 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the NPPF states the following:

states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

And that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 199 states that: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 200 states that: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Paragraph 201 states that: Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Paragraph 202 states that: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 203 states that: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The advertisement is over large as a feature of a building in comparison to the smaller scale features of the host building and surrounding buildings and would be an over dominant feature obscuring the whole front elevation, including significant elements of the roofscape and ridge

line. The advertisement would also draw attention away from the decorative façade that fronts onto Piccadilly.

The advertisement would have no relationship with the character and appearance of the conservation Area and would adversely affect the setting of adjacent grade II listed buildings at 17 and 47 Piccadilly appearing as an obtrusive and over dominant feature.

There are no public benefits associated with the display of the advertisement that justify the ongoing harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings.

This is discussed in more detail later in this Report.

Core Strategy

The following Core Strategy policies are considered relevant to this application:

Policy T1 (Sustainable Transport) states that the Council will support proposals that improve pedestrian routes and the pedestrian environment.

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) states that opportunities for good design to enhance the overall image of the City should be fully realised, particularly on major radial and orbital road and rail routes.

Policy CC9 (Design and Heritage) states that development in Manchester City Centre should preserve or enhance the heritage assets that have been identified, including listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled ancient monuments.

Policy EN3 (Heritage) states that throughout the city, the Council will encourage development that complements and takes advantage of the distinct historic and heritage features of its districts and neighbourhoods including those of the City Centre. New developments must be designed so as to support the Council in preserving or, where possible, enhancing the historic environment, the character, setting and accessibility of areas and buildings, including scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas and archaeological remains.

Policy DM1 (Development Management) states that all development should have regard to appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail, the affects on amenity including road safety and the character of the surrounding area.

Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) states that all development must make a positive contribution to areas of choice including creating well designed places that enhance or create character and protect and enhance the built environment.

Policy EN12 (Area priorities for Open Space, Sport and Recreation) states that the quality of existing areas of open space in the City Centre should be enhanced.

The advertisement is considered to be inconsistent with Core Strategy Policies SP1, DM1, T1, EN3, EN1 and EN12.

These policies seek to enhance the visual amenity of prominent access corridors and character areas and seek to achieve high standards of development and environmental treatment on sites adjoining radial entry routes into and through the City Centre and adjoining public spaces and to improve the pedestrian environment. The continued display of the proposed advertisement is

considered to be inconsistent with these policies, as it would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the visual amenity of an area next to two major radial entry routes and a principal corridor of movement through the City Centre due to its size, design, location and appearance remaining in place for a long period of time - namely 14 months to date. The submitted photo montages show that the proposed advertisement and shroud entirely masks the principle elevation of a non designated heritage asset including the ridgeline and the roofscape.

Policy SP1 of the Core Strategy also encourages regeneration and confirms that the quality of the built environment and appropriate development can contribute to regeneration. The proposals would work against these aims by continuing to be incompatible with the character and appearance of the locality and the surrounding conservation area as described above and by the proposed location on a development site.

This is discussed in more detail later in this Report.

The Unitary Development Plan for Manchester – Whilst the Core Strategy has now been adopted some of the UDP policies remain saved as there are no replacement policies contained in the Core Strategy. The relevant policies are detailed below:

The following Unitary Development Plan policies are of relevance to this application:

The following saved policies that are of relevance to this application:

E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection) which encourages upgrades to the appearance of the City's major radial and orbital routes.

The continued display of the advertisement would not represent an upgrade in appearance of a major radial entry route as it would screen the principle elevation of a non designated heritage asset, be out of scale in the locality and incompatible with the character of the surrounding conservation area. This would have a negative impact on visual amenity on two of the city's major radial routes.

Policy DC 15 (Advertisements, Hoardings and Posters) - in particular paragraphs DC15.1 and 15.2, in Part 2 of the UDP set out City Council policy in relation to advertisements, hoardings and posters. The primary issue addressed by this policy is that of visual amenity. Thus the main matters to be considered for this appeal in the context of Policy DC15 are:

- (i) The general location of the proposed development and the effect on visual amenity;
- (ii) The scope for posters and hoardings to make a positive contribution to the locality;
- (iii) The design of the structures and the relationship with any premises on which they are located;
- (iv) The effect of the proposal on permanent redevelopment of the land;
- (v) The use of the hoardings to screen vacant sites or buildings during development, or where development is known to be imminent;
- (vi) The use of hoardings to disguise or improve the appearance of unsightly features, operations or activities;
- (vii) Public safety resulting from the positioning of the design of the display;
- (viii) The scale of the advertisement in relation to the surrounding locality and the site on which it would stand.
- (ix) Whether the advertisement would be obtrusive and whether it would intrude into an area of high amenity value;
- (x) Whether the advertisement would be injurious to public safety or would adversely affect the flow of traffic, by reason of its position, size, or design.

- (xi) The number of advertisements in the locality and their cumulative effect on visual amenity.

The advertisement is considered to be inconsistent with these policies due to the following:

- The general location of the advertisement and its effect on visual amenity would be unacceptable and would not make a positive contribution to visual amenity within the locality due to its size, location appearance and design and would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of a non designated heritage asset, the setting of listed buildings and the character of the surrounding conservation area;
- The advertisement would continue to represent an obtrusive feature on two major radial entry routes into and through the City Centre due to its size, location appearance and design;
- The advertisement is not in scale with its surroundings being overly large and obtrusive in comparison to the features of the adjacent listed buildings, the nearby buildings and within the Stevenson Square Conservation Area;
- The shroud is not screening a vacant site or building during development and instead entirely screens the principle elevation of a non designated heritage asset, including the roof line. Although visiting the site on a regular basis, Officers have seen no evidence of any repair works or otherwise taking place on the upper floors of the building;

The advertisement is not screening a vacant site but screens the principle elevation of a non designated heritage asset. Screening in the way proposed is not considered to be acceptable for the reasons detailed above. There are as advised above no building works taking place on site for which the scaffold is required.

DC18.1.e (Conservation Areas) states that development proposals adjacent to Conservation Areas will be granted only where it can be shown that they will not harm the appearance or character of the area.

The continued display of the advertisement would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Stevenson Square Conservation Area due to its size, design, location and appearance. The advertisement would be over large as a feature of an elevation in comparison to the smaller scale features of the surrounding buildings and an over dominant feature being taller than the façade of the host building. The shroud would also entirely screen the principle elevation of a non designated heritage asset including the roofscape. The continued location of this advert for an extended period has harmed, and would continue to harm, the character and appearance of the Stevenson Square conservation area, having a negative impact on visual amenity in the area.

DC19.1.d (Listed Buildings) states that the City Council will seek to preserve and enhance the setting of listed buildings by appropriate control over the design of new development in their vicinity. The continued display of the advertisement is considered to have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings at 17 and 47 Piccadilly.

The advertisement is over large as a feature of a building in comparison to the smaller scale features of the non designated heritage asset and surrounding buildings and the shroud would be an over dominant feature being taller than the façade of the host building and obscuring the whole principle elevation and roof. The advertisement would also draw attention away from the decorative façade that fronts onto Piccadilly and would draw attention to construction hoardings rather than allowing the decorative frontage to appear as the most prominent feature of the site.

Public Safety

No public safety concerns have been raised in relation to this application.

Given the above, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Core Strategy Policies DM1 and T.1 and saved UDP policies DC15.1 and DC15.2.

Impact on visual amenity and on heritage assets

Hoardings of the nature proposed are generally acceptable only if they are associated with legitimate works to a site or building. The rationale being that the temporary banners will give the building a more attractive appearance within the street scene than the scaffolding alone would. The applicant has not demonstrated that development is taking place on the site. In this context it is therefore considered that the proposed hoarding would not relate to legitimate works. It is considered that there is no necessity for the banner to mitigate the visual effect of the unsightly scaffold as the scaffold is unnecessary and does not relate to actual construction works.

As set out above the advertisement would affect the setting and character of the Stevenson Square Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings at 17 and 47 Piccadilly. The proposed scaffold wrap would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of these heritage assets and to the character and appearance the Stevenson Square Conservation Area due to its intrusive albeit temporary appearance, which is emphasised by the illumination of the advertisement. The advertisements displayed would also be substantially different to a plain shroud.

This harm is not justified by the temporary nature of the works since there is and has been no substantive evidence of any works either having taken place or being contracted in relation to the upper floors of the building which would justify the need for the scaffolding and any shrouding.

As such on the proposed advertisement and its impact upon visual amenity and the heritage assets are not considered to be acceptable.

Below are a series of recent photos showing the lack of activity on the site since the works as stated in the submission were due to start on site.



08-11-22



11-11-22



31-11-22



02-12-22



13-12-22

Further comments

During the 14 month period that the advert has been displayed there has been no evidence of any of the works that formed the basis for support of the approved 2021 consent taking place, neither has there been an evidence of any works commencing in line with the Programme submitted with this application (which were due to commence week of 7th November). The City Council considers that the purpose of the advert is solely to generate income from the advertisement and given that no works have taken place during the past 14 months there is no necessity for the scaffolding, the screening of which the applicant contends should support their application. There is no case to support any contention that the scaffolding and advert are necessary to provide public benefits which outweigh the harm and indeed their continued presence without a justification which mitigates that harm, in itself caused unnecessary harm.

Should this application be approved there is nothing to stop the applicant continually applying to extend the advertisement consent on the basis that the works have been delayed and the

display becoming permanent. This is because the current scaffold is unrelated to works taking place on site.

The history of other sites in Manchester City Centre has resulted in the long term display of advertising shrouds on scaffold that are unrelated to works taking place on site and our approach to prevent this involves resisting the display of advertisements where, as in this case, they are unrelated to works taking place on site. The original consent to display an advertisement was approved in good faith and whilst it is noted that there may have been some delay due to Covid restrictions, during the past 14 months numerous development projects ranging from small scale refits to major construction projects have continued and commenced on site within the City Centre including the refurbishment of the ground floor of this building. On this basis any justification for the advert based on the lack of availability of contractors could not be substantiated.

Given the above, the proposals are considered to be contrary to sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF, policies CC9, EN3, DM1, SP1, T1, EN1 and EN12 of the Core Strategy, paragraphs 2.6 and 11.45 of the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and saved policies E3.3, DC15.1 and 15.2, DC18.1 and DC19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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 advertisement would by virtue of its size, location, design and appearance have a detrimental impact on visual amenity, constituting an unduly obtrusive, incongruous and over dominant feature located in a prominent location adjacent to radial entry routes into and throughout the City Centre and opposite quality open space. Continued temporary consents for large scale advertising hoardings on the site are not in the long term interests of the site, and a further approval would result in an 'temporary' advert being in place on the site for over 18 months with no evidence of the works upon which the previous temporary consent under application ref no 129362/AO/2021 having been carried out. The current proposal would therefore have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the amenity of the area which possesses high footfall/ pedestrian activity contrary to Government Guidance contained in Section 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Core Strategy for the City of

Manchester in particular policies T.1 (Sustainable Transport), EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas), CC9 (Design and Heritage), EN3 (Heritage), DM1 (Development Management), SP1 (Spatial Principles) and EN12 (Area priorities for Open Space, Sport and Recreation), the Guide to Development in Manchester, in particular paragraphs 2.6 and 11.45 and saved policies DC15.1, and DC15.2 (Advertisements, Hoardings and Posters), DC18.1 (Conservation Areas), DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) and E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection) of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP).

2) The proposed advertisement would by virtue of its size, location, design and appearance have a detrimental impact on visual amenity, in particular on the character, appearance and condition of the surrounding Stevenson Square conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings constituting an unduly obtrusive, incongruous and overly dominant feature within the street scene. The impact would cause less than substantial harm to the character of the conservation area and setting of listed buildings which is not outweighed by any public benefits in terms of enhancing visual amenity. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the amenity of the area and constitute unjustifiable harm to a conservation area contrary to Government Guidance contained in Section 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester in particular policies EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas), CC9 (Design and Heritage), EN3 (Heritage), DM1 (Development Management) and SP1 (Spatial Principles), the Guide to Development in Manchester, in particular paragraphs 2.6 and 11.45 and saved policies DC15.1, and DC15.2 (Advertisements, Hoardings and Posters), DC18.1 (Conservation Areas) and DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP).

3) The proposed advertisement, due to its siting and appearance, including its size and design, would have a detrimental impact upon visual amenity and regeneration - including the ongoing regeneration of the area in a prominent location within an area of the City Centre, which has seen considerable financial investment and regeneration activity resulting in an area of increasingly high amenity value - by having a poor appearance within the street scene. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be inconsistent with the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester in particular policies EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas), DM1 (Development Management) and SP1 (Spatial Principles).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
Environmental Health

Seasonal Events Area, Piccadilly Gardens, Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LS
Travelodge, 31 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LU
29 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LU
19 - 25 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LU
Nando's, 27 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LU
Third Floor, Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
Second Floor, Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
First Floor, Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
DATASYS LIMITED, Fifth Floor, Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
Ground Floor, Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
Sub Basement And Basement, 19 - 31 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LS
19 - 31 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LS
Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
Fourth Floor, Wellington House, 39 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ
Fifth Floor, 33 - 35 Piccadilly, Manchester, M1 1LQ

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - City Centre PD Restriction - Class B1(a) To C3
Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Conservation Area - Stevenson Square Conservation Area 1987
Area Team Boundary - Name: CENTRAL