
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Matthew Birkinshaw BA(Hons) Msc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/17/3171387
432 Barkerend Road, Bradford, BD3 8QJ

- 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 Jahanzeb Khan against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/09281/ADV, dated 7 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is two display boards on west and east elevations of the building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a former pub which has been converted into a madrassah and Mosque. As part of the appeal two advertisements are proposed, one on either gable-end of the building.
 4. The larger billboard would be located on the south-west facing elevation. Measuring roughly 4m x 2m it would be significant in size, and materially larger than previous signage associated with the pub. Due to the open car park adjacent to the appeal property it would also be a prominent feature in the streetscene. Although many advertisements are highly visible, approaching from the west the proposed billboard would be viewed in a largely residential setting surrounded by traditional, stone terraced houses. In this context, and attached to an otherwise predominantly blank elevation, I consider that the size, siting and prominence of the signage would result in an incongruous feature that would detract from the streetscene on Barkerend Road.
 5. A similar conclusion was reached by another Inspector considering signage on the same elevation in 2004. In summary, it was found that *"...because of its size and height...it appears as an unduly dominant feature on this largely plain elevation. The building is a traditional-looking public house with a co-ordinated range of signs and I consider that the much larger poster panel, with its modern poster images, looks out of place..."* (Ref APP/W4705/H/04/1154236, dated 15 September 2004).
-

6. The circumstances before me are slightly different. At 4m x 2m the revised scheme would be smaller. It would also be situated towards the front of the building which is no longer a pub. Nevertheless, allowing the appeal would still introduce a large, modern advertisement on the highly visible south-west elevation of the building. When viewed in the context of its largely traditional, residential surroundings, the revised scheme fails to overcome the previous Inspector's concerns.
7. The advertisement proposed on the north-east facing elevation would be smaller, but it would still be a prominent feature in the streetscene owing to the set-back of the neighbouring health centre from the road. In addition, it would be viewed in a similar context to the other side of the building, with the traditional terraced properties on the northern side of Barkerend Road dominating the streetscene. Based on the plans provided the size, siting, and design of the smaller billboard would also be at odds with the traditional character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
8. At the appeal stage the appellant has suggested that the advertisement on the north-east elevation would measure 2m x 1.5m, not 2m x 2m as originally proposed. However, no detailed plans have been provided to illustrate this change. The plans submitted with the application also fail to accurately depict the north-east facing elevation of the building which has a different window layout and design. Based on the evidence provided I am therefore not persuaded that even a smaller sign measuring 2m x 1.5m could be accommodated on this elevation without undermining the character and appearance of the host property and its immediate surroundings.
9. In considering the proposal it is noted that there is already some signage on either end of the building. Whilst the proposed billboards would only be marginally larger, the Council confirms that the temporary signs do not benefit from advertisement consent. It is therefore not possible to give this any significant weight in reaching my decision. Similarly, although the position of lighting may indicate that an advertisement was fixed to the north-east elevation of the pub in the past, it is not there now. There is also nothing to suggest that the proposal would be similar to any traditional signage associated with the pub that was part of its original character.
10. Finally, I note that the billboards are intended to advertise charitable events and activities, and would be hired to local businesses. This would generate an income to help support the running costs of Jamiah Farooqiah Bradford which relies mainly on donations. Whilst recognising the direct socio-economic benefits that would follow, based on the evidence provided they do not justify allowing the appeal given the harm that has been identified.
11. I therefore conclude that by reason of their size, siting and prominence the proposed advertisements would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As a result, the proposal conflicts with the Regulations which require decisions for advertisement consent to be made in the interests of visual amenity (and/or public safety). Although not a decisive consideration, I have also taken into account Policy D15 of the *Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District* which states that consent will only be given for the display of an advertisement which respects the interests of public safety and amenity, having regard to the characteristics of the locality. The proposal therefore also conflicts with these objectives.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Matthew Birkinshaw

INSPECTOR