
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2026

by Richard Gilbert BA (Hons) MSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005570

Land to the North East of Blackett Street, Pin Mill Brow, Manchester M12 6EJ

Easting (x): 385577 Northing (y): 397731

- 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 Layth Mousa of Bluefig Investments LLP against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 144763/AOH/2025.
 - The advertisement proposed is for a billboard sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Only the Easting and Northing co-ordinates of the appeal site were used for the address of the appeal site on the planning application form. Therefore, for clarity I have adopted the descriptive address used on the application form and the postcode cited in the council's decision notice in my banner heading above. I have also included the Easting and Northing co-ordinates for clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The advertisement hoarding would be located on an approximately triangular area of grass, bounded on one side by shrubs and trees in a prominent location on the junction of Pin Mill Brow and the A635 (Mancunian Way) in a commercial part of the city centre, next to interconnecting highways. As a small green space, it contributes positively to the appearance of the area.
5. The hoarding would be free-standing and non-illuminated and would measure approximately 3 metres by 6 metres. It would be raised 2.5 metres above ground level.
6. Currently there are two other free-standing hoardings close to the appeal site. Information before me indicates that one is unauthorised and is subject to enforcement action by the council. The other, an illuminated 48-sheet sign was allowed on appeal in 2019 (APP/B4215/Z/19/3229583).

7. The area is predominantly commercial in character and there are some large fascia signs and other signage in the vicinity of the appeal site mostly associated with commercial premises. The site has also had a long planning history associated with advertisements. However, given the siting of the proposed hoarding, the rear of the hoarding would be prominent to oncoming traffic from the Fairfield Street direction on the ring road. Whilst I have no substantive evidence that it would obscure the view of the existing illuminated hoarding, it would not relate well to either boundary treatments or planting within the area and would therefore appear particularly incongruent and would add to the proliferation of advertisements in the vicinity resulting in a cluttered appearance of the area.
8. Although the appellant states that the appeal proposal would replace a currently unauthorised hoarding parallel with the proposal, I have no mechanism before me to ensure that would be the case and whilst it is subject to current enforcement action through a removal notice, I have no evidence before me that this would be successful.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that two previous appeals have been allowed for advertisements on this parcel of land in the past, one of which is currently in situ, their siting differs from that of the appeal proposal and are therefore not directly comparable with the proposal before me. Furthermore, the 2011 appeal decision (APP/B4215/H/10/2139216) was some time ago and made in a different policy context to that of the appeal before me. Therefore, I am not persuaded that this represents either a precedent or a fallback position. Given these differences, they attract no more than limited weight and have not persuaded me that the appeal proposal would be acceptable in this location.
10. The appellant states that large poster hoardings are integral in commercial areas. Whilst it may be the case that they are more prevalent in commercial area, this does equate to the acceptability of an advertisement hoarding in the location before me. Factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality need to be taken into account in coming to a view that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the amenity of a locality. As such, I have found that the appeal proposal would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area.
11. Paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) aligns with the regulations by stating that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. Whilst adverts are commonplace in commercial areas, and a proportionate approach to decision-making should always be taken, the appeal is dismissed based upon the harm to amenity I have identified above.
12. In accordance with the regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan as far as they are material in this case. Policies JP-Strat2 and JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039 (2024) seek, amongst other things, to provide improvements in the public realm that respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials. Policies SP1, EN1, and DM1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012) pursue development that creates well designed places that contribute to the experience of all at street level. Saved Policies DC15.1, DC15.2 and E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) are also of particular relevance, as they seek to ensure new development is of the highest quality

adjacent to the city's major roads and that advertisements are appropriate to their location and to visual amenity.

13. Having regard to these policies, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on the amenity of the site and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

14. Neither party has raised concerns in respect of the proposal's effect on public safety therefore I have not dealt with this matter further.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to the development plan insofar as it was material, I have concluded that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the amenity of the site and the surrounding area. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Richard Gilbert

INSPECTOR