



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: 20th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/21/3288225

254 Huddersfield Road, Low Moor, Bradford BD12 0TJ

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04031/ADV, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is upgrade of existing 48 sheet advert to support digital poster.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Regulations to control advertisements require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. Therefore, while I have taken account of the policies and guidelines that the Council consider to be relevant, these have not been decisive in my assessment.

Main Issue

3. 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 advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is the south-facing gable end of 254 Huddersfield Road, which is an attractively-detailed, two-storey building of traditional design and construction. The building occupies a prominent corner position with frontages onto the A641 Huddersfield Road and Common Road.
5. The existing 48 sheet poster hoarding is reported to have no consent. Nevertheless, the appellant indicates that it has been displayed for more than 10 years and therefore benefits from deemed consent. The proposal is to replace this existing advertisement with an internally illuminated digital display showing sequential static images every ten seconds.
6. Due to its orientation, the advertisement would not be seen from a northerly direction. However, by virtue of its elevation, size, and siting, the advertisement would be prominent in the direct approach from the south along Huddersfield Road. Although the size and siting of the advertisement would be similar to the existing, the nature of its illumination and changing imagery

would be more conspicuous and overtly more modern in appearance than the existing hoarding. In combination with its size, this would significantly detract from the traditional character and appearance of the host building.

Furthermore, given its prominent location and the considerable distance over which it would be seen, I consider that the change in the nature of the advertisement would be a visually intrusive addition to this street scene, where despite the largely commercial character of the surroundings, there is an appreciable absence of large high-level illuminated advertisements.

7. Although the illumination of the display could be controlled to respond to changing ambient light levels and be significantly reduced at night, it would still be a highly conspicuous element due to its nature, size, and prominence. Consequently, the conditions suggested by the appellant would not overcome my concerns.
8. The proposed advertisement would lead to significant harm to the appearance of the host building and the street scene. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the visual amenity of the locality.
9. Whilst not decisive, the proposal would also conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) insofar as they seek to protect 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

10. The appellant has put forward a number of benefits of upgrading the existing display to a digital format. The investment in the site is also noted. Nevertheless, advertisements are subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The conclusion on the former is determinative in this case and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR