



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2020

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/19/3236935

Carrwood House, Carr Bottom Road, Little Horton, Bradford BD5 9AG

- 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 Mrs E Clark (Dominion Print Ltd) against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02013/ADV, dated 3 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is banner type signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in respect of sign Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for sign No 7 as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.
3. The advertisement application has been submitted on a retrospective basis. Hence, I was able to see the signs in situ as part of my site visit. For the avoidance of doubt, this appeal relates to 5 No banner signs measuring 2,500mm x 11,600mm (Signs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6); 1 No banner sign measuring 2,500mm x 10,100mm (Sign 5); 1 No banner sign measuring 34,500mm x 2,750mm (Sign 8); 1 No banner sign measuring 21,995mm x 5,934mm (Sign 9); and 1 No freestanding parking sign measuring 3,000mm x 1,000mm (Sign 7).

Background and Main Issue

4. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed free standing sign No 7 which is positioned close to the entrance to the service area does not cause harm to the amenity of the area or the matters of public safety. On my site visit, I was able to consider the size and position of this advertisement and I have no reason to disagree with the views already expressed by the Council. Furthermore, there is no issue between the parties that the remaining

advertisements do not cause harm from a public safety point of view. In this context, the main issue is the effect of sign Nos 1,2,3,4,5,6,8 & 9 on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. Owing to their substantial and disproportionate scale and use of bright colours, the two signs on the single storey building have a dominating and intrusive impact when viewed from Carr Bottom Road. I accept that there are a limited number of trees on the frontage of the site, but these do not fully screen the harmful development. When seen in the context of what is a mainly residential street, where buildings and the appeal property have predominantly muted tones, the advertisements are seen as harsh and lurid additions.
6. I acknowledge the appellant's comment that there were advertisements on the site in the past. I do not know if these benefited from advertisement consent, but, in any event, it is necessary that I determine this appeal on its individual planning merits. The advertisements on the multi-storey stone building are excessively wide and long and dominate the elevations. They introduce a form of advertisement clutter and fail to appear subordinate in scale to what is an imposing and characterful building. These advertisements are prominent and garish when seen against the muted tone of the appeal building.
7. I recognise that the site is not in a conservation area and that the buildings on the site are not listed. However, that does not justify the clear harm that has been caused to the amenity of the area.
8. I do not doubt that Dominion Print is a successful business and that the provision of such large advertisements does, to some extent, showcase what the company does. However, I am sure that it would be possible to provide more sensitive and in scale advertisements on the buildings thereby still showcasing what the company can do. On this basis, I do not consider that there is any reasonable evidence to suggest that there will be a loss of jobs if advertisement consent is refused for most of the signs. Whilst there may not have been any objections from the public in terms of this application, or in respect of the advertisements that were on site previously, this does not justify allowing advertisements where I have found clear harm to amenity.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that apart from the free standing sign No 7, the other advertisements have caused significant harm to the amenity of the area. Therefore, they do not accord with Policies DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 which collectively seek to achieve high quality and well-designed places. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed in respect of free standing sign No 7 but should be dismissed in respect of all of the other appeal advertisements.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR