



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/21/3283328

1 Ebenezer Place, Bradford BD7 3DZ

- 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 Mohammed Sharaz against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04068/ADV, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The advertisements proposed are 2 x fascia signs to front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Advertisement Regulations make clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any concerns on safety grounds. I have no reason to take a different view. Thus, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed advertisements on amenity, with due regard to the Great Horton Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is at the end of a traditional stone-built terrace at the junction of Ebenezer Place with Cross Lane, within the Great Horton Conservation Area (the CA). The CA is reflective of the area's industrial heritage, and draws some of its character and significance from the streets of 19th century terraced housing, and various examples of Victorian community and commercial buildings which grew up around them. Being typical of this character and with an understated appearance, the appeal site has a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA.
4. I am informed that the appeal site has planning permission for change of use to an online pharmacy. Nonetheless, it is part of an otherwise residential terrace and is without any typical shop frontage. In this context, the number and size of the proposed fascia signs would be dominant and discordant features on the building. The illumination of the sign on the gable end would add further to the visual intrusiveness of that advertisement in the Cross Lane street scene.
5. The appellant explains that it is a necessity for the premises to be identifiable for a number of reasons, including for regulatory and delivery purposes. Even so, I am not persuaded that this would justify the number, size and illumination of the proposed advertisements.

6. My attention has also been drawn to the signage at another online pharmacy. However, in addition to being in a different locality, this particular example is located within an established shopping parade and contains a commercial frontage, such that it is not directly comparable to the appeal site and has limited bearing on my consideration of this appeal.
7. The advertisements would lead to significant harm to the appearance of the host building and the street scene, and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area.
8. Whilst not decisive, the proposal would also conflict with Policy EN3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) insofar as it is relevant to protecting visual amenity. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework where it states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR