
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2020

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/20/3249355
1060 Manchester Road, Bradford BD5 8NN

- 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 and Mrs Shah (Food Fusion) against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04956/ADV, dated 28 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of 4 signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The advertisements have already been erected and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the visual impact of the advertisements on the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is part of a small parade of shops which is at a slightly lower level than the adjacent road and which is also set back from it by a grass verge. The road is a main arterial road into, and out of, Bradford City Centre and so carries high volumes of traffic. The appeal property has a large fascia sign on the front of the building which due to its size, draws attention to the building despite its position in relation to the road.
5. Two of the signs are located within the grass verge between the building and Manchester Road. One is a fixed rigid sign attached to a telegraph post and the other is a double sided fixed rigid sign with 2 posts. The latter in particular is a highly prominent feature in the street scene, blocking views of the parade of shops. In addition, as the signage it displays is poor quality it detracts from what is otherwise an attractive row of shops.
6. The other two advertisements comprise a uPVC banner sign fixed to the gable end of the parade of shops facing Carr Bottom Road and a rigid sign on a post in the grass adjacent to the car park to the rear of the shops. Given the appeal property is at the other end of the parade these do not relate well to the shop they are advertising. Located on an otherwise empty gable, the colourful

- banner sign is in marked contrast to the muted colours of this wall. Whilst not out of scale with the gable, it still appears as a discordant feature.
7. Although commercial premises line much of Manchester Road, advertisements comprise largely small-scale signage on the buildings themselves or on their boundary treatments. Consequently, these free-standing advertisements, which do not clearly relate to the premises, are incongruous features and create a cluttered appearance that is visually detrimental to the locality.
 8. My attention was drawn to other banner signs on the adjacent church and school. However, at the time of my site visit there was only one similar, but smaller, sign attached to the boundary wall of the church, suggesting that such signage is only used on a temporary basis. In being attached to the boundary treatments of the premises to which the signage relates they do not represent a direct parallel to the appeal scheme which is for free-standing advertisements. In any case, the sign I saw confirmed that inappropriate signage has an adverse visual impact on the area and so does not set a precedent that should be followed.
 9. The appellant has stated that the signs are needed to help promote the business, which employs local people, as it is set back from the road. However, the regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Whilst I note the comments regarding the condition of the unit before the appellant occupied it, as the appeal relates to the advertisements around the parade and not the unit itself, this has not had any bearing in my determination of the appeal.
 10. Overall, the advertisements are unduly dominant, intrusive and uncharacteristic features in the area. I therefore consider that the appeal scheme has an adverse visual impact within the surrounding area. I have taken into account Policy DS1 of the *Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2017)* which seeks to achieve high quality places informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context. Given that I have concluded that the proposal harms visual amenity, the appeal scheme conflicts with this policy.
 11. I note the Council's concerns regarding whether the correct permissions have been secured for some of the signs but this has not been relevant to my decision.
 12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR