
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2022

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/H/21/3280657

Jerk Hut, 160 Manchester Road, Longroyd Bridge, Huddersfield, HD1 3JA

- 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 Cardtronics UK Ltd, trading as CASHZONE against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/64/91486/W, dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is signage associated with an automated teller machine.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form refers to a proposal for the installation of an automated teller machine (ATM) and associated signage. However, the ATM itself is the subject of separate planning and listed building consent applications. This appeal relates to the signage only, which involves an illuminated plastic surround around the ATM and a logo panel on the machine.
3. The appeal documents suggest that the automated teller machine (ATM) has already been installed but it was not in situ at the time of my site visit. As such, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted information and drawings provided.

Main Issue

4. No party suggests that the signage would be harmful in terms of public safety and so the main issue is the effect on amenity.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is Grade II listed. At ground floor level it is currently in commercial use and stands amongst other commercial uses. The building does not fully accord with the listing description, many modern interventions apparently having taken place, from the insertion of plastic windows on upper floors, to the installation of a modern aluminium shop front and roller shutters at ground floor level in lieu of the C19 shopfront recorded. Modern fascia signage is installed and was also apparent on neighbouring commercial properties.
6. These modern interventions have undoubtedly harmed the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider terrace, but the building is

nonetheless a fine stone-built property with slate roof and interesting architectural detail, such as the stone gutter brackets and window surrounds. This is evident despite the insensitive alterations undertaken to date.

7. It is unclear to what extent the various changes have been authorised, but the Council confirms that the modern shop front has not been granted listed building consent or planning permission. As such, there is no certainty that it will remain in situ. The shop front does not form part of this appeal and is not for my consideration but nor should it be used to justify inherently inappropriate and unsympathetic modern signage, as is proposed here.
8. The proposed signage would be constructed from plastic and illuminated to increase its prominence. The modern materials, bold lettering and colours associated with the various incorporated logos would draw the eye as overtly modern features in stark contrast with the traditional design and materials of the listed building. They are insensitive and inappropriate, compounding the harm arising from the existing modern signage.
9. The scheme would harm amenity and is in conflict with Policies LP24 (a), LP25 (1.b) and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in so far as they seek to protect amenity and conserve heritage assets.
10. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR