The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MScTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/Z/21/3285935
1 Bradley Road, Bradley, Huddersfield HD2 1UZ

- 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 ARM Capital against the decision of Kirklees Council.
- The application Ref 2021/64/92372/W, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2021.
- The advertisement proposed is described as a non-illuminated 48 sheet paper billboard on the east side gable elevation of the dwelling at No.1 Bradley Road. The base of the advertisement is proposed to be 2.5 metres from the ground, and it is proposed to be a height of 3 metres, a width of 6 metres and a depth of 0.15 metre.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is described differently on the various appeal documents so I have opted for the more comprehensive description given on the appeal form.

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 gable end of 1 Bradley Road, which is a modest end-of-terrace residential property of traditional design and construction. The building occupies a prominent position at a busy road junction.

5. The surrounding area contains a number of commercial premises that exhibit a variety of advertisements, both on and around the buildings. These are particularly prevalent further to the east on Leeds Road, and would help to mitigate the effect of the proposed advertisement in longer range views when approaching from that direction.

6. Nonetheless, at closer range the advertisement would be experienced against a more restrained predominantly residential backdrop. In this more immediate context, it would be seen as a large and unsympathetic addition to the host building, which would significantly detract from its traditional character and appearance, and the contribution it makes to the street scene in this regard. Consequently, the advertisement would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the visual amenity of the locality, notwithstanding the site is not a listed building or within a conservation area.

7. Whilst not decisive, the proposal would also conflict with Policies LP24(a) and LP25 1(a) and (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan 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

8. The appellant has put forward a number of benefits of the advertisement. Nevertheless, advertisements are subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety.

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR