



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1st April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/19/3241552

100-102 Ground Floor, Sale Road, Manchester, M23 0BX

- 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 Mr Fahad Ishfaq against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 123982/AO/2019, dated 20 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is described by the appellant as "displayed advertisement for the front of the shop to display the shop name. The base of the sign is made from aluminium and plastic and the writing on top of that is printed on to the base. The advertisement is used to display the shop name, to let the locals know that the shop is open for business."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. 100-102 Sale Road lies within a local centre known as Sale Circle which comprises a mix of mainly commercial properties. It is a larger than average two storey premises in a prominent corner location with commercial units at the ground floor.
5. The proposal is for a non-illuminated fascia sign advertising the business along the front and side elevation of the premises. Although I have no drawings of the proposed sign, I note from the application form that it would measure 16.7m long by 1.21m deep and be 2.59m from ground level. From the site visit it was noted that the fascia boarding is currently in situ, with temporary advertisements displayed upon it.
6. The majority of the commercial properties in the vicinity have fascia signage which is shallower than that proposed, in keeping with the proportions of the buildings on which they are displayed. Those that are deeper are in less

prominent locations and do not cause harm to the visual amenity of the area. The depth of the proposed sign would appear bulky and disproportionate to the shop front and adjoining existing signage even though the shop has long front and side frontages. Due to both the height and length of the signage, and the prominent location of the building within the street scene, it would be an intrusive and dominant feature on both the building itself and in the wider area.

7. The Council has drawn my attention to Development Plan policies which they consider relevant to this appeal. However, powers under the Regulations¹ to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interest of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterates this approach. I have therefore taken them into account insofar as they are relevant to those matters.
8. For the reasons set out above, the advertisement, by reason of its position, height and size would be seen as a dominant and intrusive feature within the street scene. As such the advertisement would harm the amenity of the surrounding area. In that respect the advertisement is contrary to saved policies DC14.1 and DC14.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, which although not decisive, seek to ensure that new advertisements would not materially harm the visual amenity of the area where the premises are located.

Other Matters

9. It is stated that the proposed shop front advertisement is required to ensure that shoppers know that the premises are open for business and to prevent further financial loss to the appellant. The site is located on a busy through road and is visible from the highway. I note that no objections have been raised by the Council to the principle of signage at the premises. However, I am not persuaded that signage of the depth and length proposed would be necessary in this location to attract custom and therefore this argument carries little weight.
10. I also note the appellant's concern over the application process. This is not however a matter for this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended)

