
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/20/3249773

Station Hotel, 434 Manchester Road, Bradford BD5 7RA

- 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 Global against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/05065/ADV, dated 3 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is an upgrade of the existing wall mounted 1x48 sheet advertisement to 1x48 sheet digital LED display unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant considers that the existing display has deemed consent by virtue of Class 13 in Schedule 3 of the Regulations. The Council has indicated that there appears to be no express consent for the advert and states that in any case Regulation 8 of the Advertising Regulations (2008) allows them to serve a discontinuance of deemed consent notice. This issue is a matter between the appellant and the Council and ultimately one for the Courts to determine. I have determined the appeal on its individual merits in the light of the prevailing circumstances. The decision on the appeal does not affect any 'deemed consent' rights which may apply to the current display.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a gable end of a public house located at a road junction on Manchester Road - a major arterial route into, and out of, Bradford City centre that carries high volumes of traffic. The surrounding area contains a mix of uses but although predominantly commercial in nature, housing is found to the rear of the site and on other side roads. Whilst a variety of advertising is found on the commercial premises in the area, free-standing poster hoardings are limited in number.
5. Unlike the front elevation of the public house, the gable end is a plain, rendered wall that contains no architectural detailing. Its muted colour reduces

its impact in the street scene. The proposed LED display unit would be located at first floor level. It would occupy a similar position and be a similar size to the unilluminated hoarding currently in situ. Although it would fit within the gable, its size and scale, would be such that it would be a dominant feature on the building. Whilst lighting levels can be controlled, the brightly coloured and illuminated advertisements would draw attention to the gable in a way that the current hoarding does not.

6. There would be no views of the advertising unit when travelling into the city centre. However, in the other direction, the elevated position of the hoarding and the gentle rise of the road, means it would be clearly visible over some distance. There is a general absence of large scale advertising hoardings in the area and the majority of the commercial signage in the vicinity is at lower levels and more modest in size. As a result, the proposal would be an incongruous feature in the street scene and detrimental to visual amenity.
7. In contrast to the hoarding on the gable at present, the internal illumination and ability to display multiple static images would make the advertisement much more prominent particularly at night, even though as a major vehicular route, the levels of street lighting means the area is well lit. Given this, I consider that the presence of the existing hoarding does not justify the current proposal. Whilst I note the advantages to the appellant in being able to change the poster images remotely, this does not lead me to a different conclusion.
8. Overall, by reason of its position, nature and size, the proposed advertisement would be an obtrusive, dominant and uncharacteristic feature in the area. I have taken into account Policies DS1 and DS3 of the *Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2017)* which seek to achieve high quality places, and ensure that developments respond and contribute to the character of the area. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm visual amenity, the appeal scheme conflicts with these policies.
9. I accept that conditions could be used to control the level of illumination of the sign, that new digital screens are slimmer, and that it is agreed it would not be detrimental to public safety. However, this would not overcome the harm I consider that the proposal would cause to the visual amenity of the area.
10. For the reasons set out above I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR