

54-56 SWAN STREET, MANCHESTER

EMAIL TRAIL

Application 133410/AOH/2022 54-56, Swan Street , M4
5JU



Chris Thomas [REDACTED]

Mon, 9 May,
11:30

to adam.mitchell

Mr Mitchell

You kindly forwarded the Highways Dept comments on 17 April. They confirmed that they had no objections subject to certain conditions which we had already proposed.

Do you envisage any amenity objections? I should be glad to discuss any issues which you think might be problematic.

Regards

Chris Thomas



Adam Mitchell

Tue, 10 May,
14:19

to Chris

Good afternoon Chris,

I hope you are well. After reviewing the plans and reviewing the application with my boss, the City Council would take the judgement that this application would be a refusal based on the successful on-going regeneration happening within this area. The Council believes this proposal is unnecessary signage for the location.

Kind regards,

Adam.

Adam Mitchell
Planning Technician

From: Chris Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 9, 2022 11:30 AM
To: Adam Mitchell [REDACTED]
Subject: Application 133410/AOH/2022 54-56, Swan Street , M4 5JU



Chris Thomas [REDACTED]

Tue, 10 May,
16:04

to Paul, Adam

Adam

I fear that I do not understand the reference to the impact of the proposed panel on the regeneration of the area.

You will see from the Planning Statement which we submitted that we are very aware of the regeneration in the surroundings. Further, we refer to the likelihood that the building on the application site itself (and the adjacent terrace) is almost certainly to be demolished and redeveloped. It is for this reason that we applied for consent for a period of 3 years only. The proposed advertisement is essentially temporary. Naturally, when the site is redeveloped, the advertisement will go.

We cannot see how our proposal would in any way impact upon the overall regeneration of the area or its appearance until further regeneration (ie the redevelopment of the application site itself) takes place. It cannot be argued but that the renewal of the wall background banner and replacement of the old poster hoarding with a brand new, modern panel would be anything but an enhancement to the site itself. An Inspector has already determined that a panel on the site would not harm any nearby listed buildings or the adjacent conservation area. And since that appeal decision, nothing significant has altered. Nor would the replacement panel be novel. As we point out, there are several other digital panels surrounding the application site.

So the application is made in the full understanding of the changing nature of the site and surrounding area. It offers an enhancement to the appearance of the site and street for the period until full redevelopment can take place. We cannot see how this can be seen as other than an enhancement of a situation already sanctioned by an appeal decision.

Finally, I would draw your attention to national planning advice in the PPG. Paragraph ID 18b-026-20140306 in the section "Advertisements" reminds local authorities that consent for an advertisement cannot be refused because the authority consider the advertisement to be "misleading, **unnecessary**, or offensive ..". To refuse this application because it is "unnecessary signage for the location" (as you say) would be unlawful as contrary to the requirements of the Control of Advertisements Regulations. These require that all decisions be based on amenity and public safety. You have already advised that, subject to conditions which we are prepared to accept, public

safety is not a problem. I should therefore be glad to know what aspects of amenity (ie visual amenity) remain of concern.

Chris Thomas



Adam Mitchell

Thu, 12 May,
15:58

to Chris, Paul

Good morning Chris,

Thank you for your email and the points you have made. Unfortunately, the City Council's stance has not changed with this application and I will seek to refuse this application before the determination date.

Kind regards,
Adam

Adam Mitchell
Planning Technician
Development Management North
Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development
Manchester City Council

From: Chris Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 4:04 PM
To: Adam Mitchell [REDACTED] Paul Hardy
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Application 133410/AOH/2022 54-56, Swan Street , M4 5JU



Chris Thomas <chris@christhomasltd.co.uk>

Thu, 12 May,
17:53

to Adam

Adam

You do not answer my question about what aspects of visual amenity concern you. This is crucial to the consideration of the application; and it may be that whatever concerns you have can be overcome if only we knew what they were. It would be courteous to at least let us know what the problem actually is.

I would happily discuss and am available at your convenience on 07957 870080. I look forward to hearing from you.

Chris Thomas



Chris Thomas

Wed, 25 May, 09:21 (2 days ago)

to Adam, Paul

Mr Mitchell

You did not reply to my email of 10 May about exactly what amenity concerns you have in this application.

I have tried to call you without success (though I have left a message on your voicemail).

I should be grateful if you could call me to let me know exactly what concerns you have - I don't want this application to fail simply because you have concerns which we might be able to address.

Regards

Chris Thomas



Adam Mitchell

Wed, 25 May, 17:14 (2 days ago)

to Chris, Paul

Good afternoon Chris,

Thank you for your patience, it has been a rather busy few days. After reviewing the proposal with my boss earlier on today unfortunately the City Council's view has not changed from my previous email. Based on the visual amenity concerns the Council has with this application we will proceed with the refusal decision. The Council takes the view that the proposed LED illuminated 48-sheet poster would be a dominant feature and would add significant visual clutter, constituting an unduly obtrusive, incongruous and over dominate feature within in a highly prominent location. The proposal would be an inappropriate type of development on a prominent site. Therefore, the concerns stated above are fundamental issues with this application.

Kind Regards,

Adam.

Adam Mitchell
Planning Technician

From: Chris Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 May 2022 9:21 AM
To: Adam Mitchell [REDACTED]; Paul Hardy
[REDACTED]
Subject: Application 133410/AOH/2022 54-56, Swan Street , M4 5JU



Chris Thomas [REDACTED]

Wed, 25 May, 17:52 (2 days ago)

to Adam, Paul

Adam

You do not appear to have read the Inspector's decision which gave consent for the existing panel on this site.

All of the considerations you mention must have been taken into account when that decision was made, ie the Inspector was content that a panel of exactly the same size in the same position was not detrimental to amenity. What reason do you have for disagreeing with the Planning Inspector?

Chris Thomas



Paul Hardy via routeitsolutions890.onmicrosoft.com [REDACTED] 26 May, 11:24 (23 hours ago)

to Adam, Chris

Hello Adam,

I do some work for the applicant, the Manchester Screen Co and they have retained Chris to deal with this application for them. I have spoken to the Client and explained what you have said. They have asked if I would also email you because they find it very difficult to understand the logic to what you have said. The points they asked if I could put to you are as follows:

You and you manager appear to be assessing this application as if it we a virgin location, do you not? There is an illuminated 48-sheet in situ, which was previously approved. !

The application simply seeks a temporary consent to change the method in which the advert is displayed, from printed PVC / back illuminated, to an advert created digitally, like so many others in Manchester, both on City Council land with Ocean Outdoor and some which are in close proximity to this site. How is this one different? The three sites which are in close proximity were lightboxes are now digital. Chris referred to these in his planning statement; two of them are much larger also; one is a 96-sheet, 12m wide! One even bigger, at 18m wide! Taking that into account, the previous approval on this site for the display for an illuminated

48-sheet, along with the reasons presented to you in Chris's Planning Statement as to why this modernisation of this site to display adverts digitally, as opposed to printed (and also to replace the unsightly PVC banner which screen the unsightly former part wall behind it), the applicant cannot understand your stance, it is simply unreasonable they have said. The reasons you have cited do not make sense. The applicant feels that you are clearly prejudiced against this submission, simply because it is an advertisement application and are not judging it on its individual merits. They have asked whether you have actually read Chris's planning Statement and looked at the reasons cited in it as to why there can be no other logical conclusion; than this application should be approved.

Any consent would only be for a temporary period as applied for, they have said. The area has undergone significant regeneration as well all know. This will no doubt include, in the relatively near future, this building being demolished and the site redeveloped, a significant scheme as well they are sure.

Can you please reconsider your opposition to the application? The grounds you have given are unreasonable bearing in mind there is a panel in situ that was approved by the planning Inspectorate, after your Local Authority previously refused it.

I would be pleased if you could reply to the points I have raised above and also to the very important question Chris put to you "What reason do you have for disagreeing with the Planning Inspector"?

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely

Paul Hardy



Adam Mitchell

Thu, 26 May, 17:34 (17 hours ago)

to Paul, Chris

Hello Paul,

Thank you for your email. The City Council's position would be that the local context has changed since the appeal decision back in 2008. The New Cross SRF is currently being implemented with a concentrated effort around the application site. Therefore the City Council takes the view that the proposed application undermines New Cross SRF'S objectives through the visual amenity impacts by creating an unduly obtrusive, incongruous and over dominate feature within a highly prominent location.

Kind Regards,

Adam.

Adam Mitchell

Planning Technician



Chris Thomas

Thu, 26 May, 18:09 (16
hours ago)

to Adam, Paul

Adam

I have examined the New Cross SRF. The application site is in Zone A which is planned for mainly residential use, although Swan Street is proposed to retain a commercial frontage. The SRF clearly envisages the demolition of the whole frontage (described as "poor" and "no frontage") and its replacement with buildings to match those on the opposite side. Clearly, when this happens, the panel will go at the same time - there would be no wall left!

But nothing is happening to this Swan Street frontage at present - nor can you identify anything which will physically change the appearance of Swan Street in the immediate future. The application site and Swan Street remain substantially as seen by the Inspector in 2009. Why should an Inspector therefore take a different view of the same situation over the short term, ie until demolition and redevelopment begins? The Inspector in 2009 found that the panel would not harm amenity, ie it would not be obtrusive, incongruous or overly dominant as you claim. Please tell me exactly what in the street scene has changed which would demand that an Inspector today would view the panel differently (particularly bearing in mind that we accept that the display will only be appropriate until redevelopment happens)?

Chris Thomas