



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/Z/25/3375888

Land at 158 Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester M8 8LQ

- 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 Kausar Farhana of Arkangel Towers Ltd against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 143641/AO/2025.
 - The advertisement proposed is for the installation of two free-standing LED signage for advertisement for the upcoming construction.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The Council has confirmed that the submitted plans are those which were considered during the planning application. I have taken into account the same. For clarity, these relate to drawing references 081_08 – Revision A; 081_09 – Revision A; and 180_13 – Revision A.
4. Both main parties have referred to development plan policies, and I have taken them into account as material considerations, since the power to control advertisements may be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety only. The policies alone have not been decisive. The Council do not have concerns regarding public safety, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, my recommendation focuses on the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity which is the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site consists of open, undeveloped land occupying a prominent corner plot on Cheetham Hill Road, a well-trafficked arterial corridor leading towards Manchester's city centre. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial, characterised by a varied mix of businesses, service and light industrial uses. This concentration of activity results in a diverse range of shopfront designs and an abundance of both illuminated and non-illuminated advertisements in differing sizes, styles, and formats, and which contribute to an animated streetscape.

6. The proposed advertisements would have a slender profile, and the luminance levels were deemed suitable by the Council's Highway Authority and Environmental Health section. Nonetheless, they would occupy prominent positions at the outer front corners of the appeal site. Their considerable heights and large rectangular form, incorporating illuminated digital panels on one face, would also be visually striking and draw the eye. Positioned close to the edge of the public pavement and projecting forward of the flanking terraced row's building line, the structures would appear isolated and dominating. Combined with their substantial scale, illumination and appearance, they would result in a pronounced and intrusive presence within the street scene.
7. There is a proliferation of signage in the area that includes large sized format boards and high level fascia signs. Generally, these are not illuminated and are positioned against the frontages or façades of existing buildings. In the absence of any details, I am also uncertain whether the cited signage has received consent.
8. Although a large illuminated digital display exists near to Number 143 Cheetham Hill Road, it differs from the appeal scheme as it is framed against a large gable wall and faces a single direction only. The appeal site had historically sited two substantially sized signage boards that covered majority of its frontage. These have been removed, and the site has remained as an open, vacant plot since. They do not set any positive design precedent.
9. For these reasons, the proposed advertisements would be harmful to the amenity of the area and would fail to comply with the 2007 Regulations. They would be contrary to the aims of Policies EN 1, SP 1 and DM 1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012; Saved Policies DC15.1, DC15.2, CC4 and E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995; Policy JP-S1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024; and the Strangeways Local Plan as far as they are material to the main issue.
10. These policies seek, amongst other things, for proposed developments to create well designed places, to enhance the overall image of the city and the character of Cheetham Hill Road, by upgrading the appearance of major radial and orbital roads. Proposed developments are required to have regard to appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.

Other Matters

11. There are two listed buildings nearby which I saw on my site visit. One bears the inscription 'Prestwich Union Offices' to the front, indicating its historical function as a public building. Both buildings display traditional architecture, with a red brick exterior and ornate sandstone detailing. As the appeal site lies a distance away on the opposite side of the road, the appeal scheme would be noticeably separated from these listed buildings. As such, the proposal would not impinge on their historic or architectural significance, also since they are located within a commercially built-up area, where there is a mix of both historic buildings and modern developments.
12. Matters relating to the Council's level of engagement, lack of suggestion of any potential amendments, and the adequacy of their evidence should be taken up with them directly and are not for me to resolve here. In addition, the economic and regeneration benefits put forward by the appellant from two digital displays would be modest. As such, and putting aside the limitations of what can be considered

under the regulations, they carry only very limited weight and would be, should they be relevant, insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Due to the harm I have found to amenity, the proposed advertisement would not be acceptable under the aforementioned regulations. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR