

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2016

by B.S.Rogers BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/G/16/3147624

Land at 2-4 Meanwood Road, Leeds, LS7 2AA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a Discontinuance Notice relating to the use of a site for the display of advertisements with deemed consent.
 - The appeal is made by Clear Channel UK Limited against discontinuance action by Leeds City Council.
 - The Council reference is 15/01059/UAH3.
 - The Discontinuance Notice is dated 25 January 2016.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed. The Discontinuance Notice shall come back into effect immediately and the use of the site for the display of an advertisement with deemed consent shall cease by the end of a period of 8 weeks from the date of this decision.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellants claim the address is not accurate on the Notice. However, the Notice clearly describes the location of the advertisement in question and indicates its position on the plan attached to the Notice. The appellants further consider the Notice includes the incorrect description of the advertisement as a 'hoarding'. However, the consent for this advertisement, granted in 2008 (LPA ref: 08/00065/ADV), describes it as an 'advertisement hoarding to side of factory'. The appellants can be in no doubt as to which advertisement is the subject of the Notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The advertisement panel is located in a prominent position, adjacent to the junction of Meanwood Road and Clay Pit Lane. When the advertisement was granted consent in 2008, for a 3 year period, there appears to have been an adjoining tannery, which the Council indicates was part of a derelict and unsightly area. This consent seems to me to have been consistent with Policy BD12 of the Leeds UDP (Review) 2008 which indicates that advertisement hoardings may be acceptable around building sites or where they screen unsightly areas.

5. Since then, there has been a very significant change of circumstances. In 2014, planning permission was granted for a new kitchen showroom, with associated offices etc on the adjoining land. This has now been completed and brought into use. I agree with the Inspector who dismissed a recent appeal concerning a proposed replacement advertisement on this site in May 2016 (Ref: APP/N4720/Z/16/3143351) that *"The showroom is of an attractive, modern design; constructed with powder coated cladding, stone infill panels and full height glazing to the first and second floors. The glazing wraps around the front elevation of the building onto the side elevation where, at first floor, it currently sits behind the existing advertisement panel."*
6. I regard the new showroom as a significant component of the regeneration of this part of Leeds, which acts as a gateway to the City Centre. The large and elevated advertisement panel is very poorly related to the form and design of the adjacent showroom, obscuring a number of the architectural features of this building, and appears incongruous and obtrusive in this context. I see no basis for the appellants' claim that the side of this building is featureless. The presence of the advertisement panel appears to me to cause substantial injury to the appearance and amenity of the locality.
7. The appellants submit that advertisements should be expected in a commercial/business area such as this and have pointed to the presence of other large advertisements nearby in the central reservation of the highway. However, these appear to have been purpose designed for their context and do not exhibit the design deficiencies of the advertisement which is the subject of this appeal.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework points out that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment, and that appears to me to be the case here. UDP Policies BD8 and BD12 and Core Strategy Policy P10 all seek to deliver high quality design, with due regard given to local context. I am in little doubt that the advertisement in question does not accord with those policies or their aims. The benefit to the appellants' business of retaining the advertisement is heavily outweighed by the harm to the amenity of the area.

Other matters

9. The occupants of the adjacent building have pointed to the adverse impact of the advertisement on the outlook from, and daylight entering, one of the offices. I agree that this is a further disadvantage of the scheme.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the appeal should fail.

B.S. Rogers

Inspector