
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/19/3242384

137 South Parkway, Seacroft, Leeds LS14 6ER

- 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 One Stop Stores Ltd against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03737/ADV, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement signage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of replacement signage. 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 and the following non-standard condition 'the illumination of the fascia signage shall be static only'.

Procedural Matters

2. The signage has been installed at the premises and I am satisfied that this broadly accords with the submitted drawings, I am therefore considering the appeal on that basis. The description of the proposal on the decision notice varies from that on the application form. I have used that from the application form as it satisfactorily describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a convenience store set within the western end of a commercial parade with retail frontages at ground floor level. The area has a broadly residential character. The store has two sections of frontage. One is recessed beneath a canopy which spans the central part of the parade while the other sits slightly forward on the western projecting wing.
5. A variety of signs are included as part of the appeal proposal, including trough lit fascia signage to both sections of frontage, PETG frames, window graphics, ACM panels, poster cases and a window manifestation. The signage within the parade at other premises contains a mixture of both illuminated and non-illuminated signage.
6. The signage is not of excess scale and has been designed so as to be appropriate to the frontages of the unit. The fascia signage on the projecting

wing is more prominent than that within the main body of the parade and it has a greater width and depth. However, while it is slightly more prominent in appearance than the fascia signage beneath the canopy it is not excessively so. I have also been mindful of the relatively bulky and prominent fascia sign which is incorporated into the frontage of the Coral premises which occupies the ground floor unit on the projecting eastern wing of the parade.

7. Whilst a number of signs are included within the proposal, the premises does benefit from a large double frontage and I do not consider the number of signs to be excessive on what is an established commercial frontage. Although the premises are in a residential area and sit in a slightly elevated position, residential properties do not directly face the appeal site, with a parking area and open space to the south. The signage does not therefore appear out of place in relation to the building or its surroundings.
8. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the signs, both individually and cumulatively cause no harm to the visual amenity of the area. They accord with saved Policies BD8, BD9 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (2019) which seek amongst other things good quality signage which would not detract from the character or the visual amenity of the area. I have noted that guidance within the SPD¹ does not appear to have relevance as it states that it does not provide guidance on signs, such as shop signs.

Conditions

9. The council has indicated within its report that a condition would be suitable to control the level of illumination associated with the fascia signs. In this case the design of the lighting is shown on the drawings and the level of illumination is specified on the application form. I have no reason to consider this would be inappropriate. A non-standard condition in relation to this matter is therefore unnecessary.
10. The application form indicates that the illumination would be intermittent, rather than static. This would have a negative impact on visual amenity. It would not be usual for fascia signage to be intermittently illuminated, but for the avoidance of doubt, a non-standard condition has been to ensure that static illumination is used.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, the appeal should be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Leeds City Council Advertising Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006