



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2022

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/22/3302706

Premier Inn 72 Dale Street Manchester M1 2HR

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Premier Inn Hotels Limited against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 132121/AO/2021, dated 2 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is a wall mounted projecting externally illuminating roundel (600mm Diam) on the North East Elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent for the display of a wall mounted projecting externally illuminating roundel (600mm Diam) is granted as applied for and in accordance with the luminance details amended by email of the 14 April 2022. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council issued a split decision in which express advertisement consent was granted for 3 signs mounted on the building. These are not included in the description of the proposal in the banner heading above. For the avoidance of doubt my consideration relates only to the wall mounted projecting roundel sign, identified as Item 03(Qty 1) P1-E-18 on the plans submitted.
3. The application form stated the proposed luminance of the signs incorrectly. The appellant confirmed by email of the 14 April 2022 that the signage will have a luminance of 600 candelas per square metre. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, the Dale Street Premier Inn, is a multi storey, modern hotel located in a mixed commercial and residential area within Manchester City Centre. It is adjacent to the Stevenson Square Conservation Area (CA) and

within the vicinity of a number of listed buildings including former 19th century warehouses, offices and canal locks. Opposite the hotel entrance and beyond a Victorian archway is an unsurfaced car park.

6. Currently there is an externally illuminated hanging sign at the entrance to the Premier Inn building on Dale Street. The Council's concern relates to the proposed replacement of this sign which would be a wall mounted externally illuminated double sided roundel projecting from the wall of the building some 3.6 metres above ground level. The principal concern expressed by the Council relates to the depth of the sign, which is in excess of their preferred depth of 30mm. There is no information or any policy justification before me as to the basis of these concerns.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed roundel sign would be of greater depth than the existing entrance sign. However it would be of a generally smaller size and notwithstanding the introduction of the Premier Inn logo, the absence of letters from the sign would give it a simpler cleaner appearance than the existing sign. Notwithstanding its depth, the projecting roundel would be relatively small in size compared to the frontage and the height of the building. In the context of the tall buildings within this locality it would not appear unduly prominent or incongruous. I am therefore satisfied that there will be no unacceptable cumulative effect or any significant harm to the visual amenity of the area.
8. The appeal site is separated by some distance from the listed buildings within the immediate locality. Given this separation, the size of the proposed roundel and the mixed urban surroundings it would not dominate or adversely impact on the setting of the listed buildings. Albeit of a different style and form to the one it would replace, the roundel would not unduly impact on views from and into the CA given its size and the separation distances.
9. The Regulations require that decisions are made in the interests of amenity and public safety. No concerns have been raised by the Council in respect of public safety issues and I would agree with this assessment. I find no conflict with the Development Plan policies drawn to my attention which seek to protect amenity so far as they are relevant in accordance with the Regulations. Given that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies. Nor does the proposal conflict with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to design or the historic environment.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal is allowed. I have imposed the five standard conditions as set out in the Regulations. No additional conditions are necessary.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR