

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/16/3157355
57 Bradford Road, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 6AT

- 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 Azher Khan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04866/ADV, dated 6 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 illuminated sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I saw at my site visit that the sign has been erected.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The Council have drawn my attention to the policies they consider to be relevant to the appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, the Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety taking account of any material factors. Consequently, in my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not by themselves been decisive.
 5. The building upon which the sign has been installed is situated on a busy road which is characterised by the variety of its predominately commercial buildings and uses. I saw at my site visit that the appeal building has an attractive stone gabled façade with a central clock and that a shopfront type window spans a significant part of the width of the gable.
 6. I understand that the sign occupies part of the building where there were formerly fascia signs. I also understand that there have been a number of alterations made to the building which are not before me in this appeal.
 7. The protruding box type sign is formed from black aluminium and has internally illuminated lettering. Whilst I saw at my site visit that there is some variety in signage in the area, my observations accord with the comment of the Council in that signs in the area are typically not internally illuminated. The sign extends beyond the width of the shop front, and has a significant depth. Whilst
-

I note that the sign is so proportioned so as to cover the wooden frame and lintel which I noted during my site visit, and to provide secure fixing, the size of the sign, its protrusion off the face of the building, and internal illumination give rise to a significant dominating effect on the façade of the building.

8. Furthermore, I consider that sign, due to its harmful effect on the appearance of the host building, also detracts from the amenity of the wider street scene. It has been put to me that the sign harms the setting of the Grade II listed Longwood Hall, which is situated opposite the site across Bradford Road. However, given the relative positioning of the buildings, the local characteristics of the area and the limited extent of co-visibility, I consider that the sign has a neutral effect on the setting of the listed building and this does not weight against the proposal.
9. The front of the building is set back behind the footway and longer distance views of it along Bradford Road are limited by an advertising hoarding panel which I understand is on the appeal premises and a sign and fence on the property to the other side. However, given that the building itself is of a distinctive form and occupies an open road frontage, I consider that the building is nevertheless prominent when viewed from nearby on Bradford Road.
10. The appellant has set out that signage is needed for customers to find the business given that it is set back from the edge of the road, but the prominence of the appeal building in the street scene is such that I give this argument little weight. I have also considered the comments that the building was formerly derelict and has been brought back into use and that the sign gives the building a more modern look with the appellant having received positive comments regarding the development. In this regard I have considered the comments that bringing the building back into use has had both environmental and economic benefits as sought by the National Planning Policy Framework. I have also considered the comment that without signage the business may have to relocate, but there is little evidence before me in this regard. However these factors do not provide sufficient justification to allow a sign that has caused the harm described above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I consider that the sign is unacceptable on amenity grounds and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR