



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/20/3245257

4 Easy Road, Cross Green, Leeds LS9 0AZ

- 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 Clear Channel UK against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/06627/ADV, dated 17 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2019.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as one LED digital advertising screen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a small area of land running perpendicular to Easy Road, a busy road to the south east of Leeds City Centre. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential but is interspersed with a number of commercial uses including a MOT garage immediately to the east of the appeal site.
4. There is an existing free standing 'paper and paste' poster advertisement which sits on the boundary of the MOT garage facing north-east along Easy Road. Immediately behind the advertisement there is a public footpath linking Easy Road with the wider residential area and beyond the footpath, around 5 metres to south west of the advertisement, there is a two storey dwelling with windows facing directly onto the rear side of the advertisement.
5. It is proposed to replace the existing advertisement with a lightweight digital advertisement that would display multiple static advertisements on a rotation. According to the information submitted as part of this appeal, the proposed level of illumination during the hours of darkness would be restricted to 300cd/m² and always be within the guidelines as set by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP). The positioning and orientation of the advertisement would remain as existing however, the proposed advertisement would be slightly larger (in depth) than the existing poster.
6. I note the appellant's submissions that there is an abundance of existing signage along Easy Road and nearby Cross Green Lane. However, I saw during

my site visit that the existing displays predominantly relate to fascia signage rather than advertisements. There are no other large scale illuminated advertisements in the immediate locality that display moving images and this design consistency is a positive element in the context of the suburban location.

7. I consider that the illuminated, frequently changing images displayed on the appeal proposal would be incongruous when viewed against the backdrop of the adjacent residential properties and would be at odds with the predominantly residential character of the wider area. As such, the proposal would appear as a prominent, inharmonious and visually intrusive feature in the street scene thus, causing harm to the amenity of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would fail to accord with the amenity requirements of Policies GP5, BD8 and BD9 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, Leeds Core Strategy 2014 Policy P10 and the Advertising Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006.

Other Matters

8. I accept that there is an existing advertisement at the site, this does not in itself justify additional harm to the amenity of the area.
9. I have had regard to the benefits of the proposal in terms of the reduced maintenance, potential for increased business rates and the ability to display non-commercial advertising and emergency messaging. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR