



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2019

by D Child BA BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/19/3220919

61 Leeds Road, Shipley BD18 1BZ

- 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 Christopher Farrell of Directional Signs against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/03941/ADV, dated 14 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2018.
 - The advertisement is described as 8 ft x 4 ft attached to fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my visit the advertisement was being displayed. I shall proceed to consider the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is displayed on a major arterial route linking Shipley and the suburbs of Bradford and Leeds, located within the Saltaire World Heritage Site Buffer Zone. The advertisement gives advance notice of a right turn to a fast food restaurant, and the days when the business is open 24 hours a day.
5. Because the advertisement is positioned adjacent to existing signage relating to a car sales business, it would not be isolated. On this side of the highway the area is predominantly commercial in character. Nevertheless, the area opposite the site is predominantly residential, and because it is elevated above the appeal site it looks down onto the advertisement. Although it is non-illuminated, the bright red background of the sign contrasts sharply with the light painted gable of the building behind, detracting from its otherwise largely uncluttered appearance. Cumulatively with existing signage in the area, it results in visual clutter which is harmful to the appearance of the area.
6. It is argued that the business to which it relates cannot be seen until after one has turned into the site of the restaurant. However, I saw at the entrance to the premises a large high-level advert for the business, positioned on a tower. This adequately signals its presence to approaching road users. I am not

therefore persuaded that there is any overriding highway safety need for the appeal sign that would outweigh the identified harm.

7. There are economic benefits the business brings to the local area. However, the business is already well established, and, in my view, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, its continued contribution to the local economy does not rest on display of the advertisement. I therefore give this consideration little weight.
8. The historic grant of consent for a smaller poster display of a different design¹ does not provide a justification for the appeal advertisement; while I do not have full details, each case must be considered on its individual merits with regard to the circumstances.
9. I therefore find that the advertisement is harmful to the visual amenity of the area. Consequently, it conflicts with Paragraph 132 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Child

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference: 00/01521/ADV