



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/23/3315777

201 Lower Wortley Road, Lower Wortley, Leeds LS12 4PX

- 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 Global against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/06866/ADV, dated 10 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is a non-illuminated poster panel.
-

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 did not raise any concern in relation to public safety, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity, with due regard to a nearby listed building.

Reasons

4. Lower Wortley Road contains a number of small ground floor commercial uses which gives the area a mixed residential and commercial character. The signage associated with these commercial premises is mostly in the format of modest fascia signage above the shopfront, but there is also some small-scale signage present on a few of the gable ends. No individual advertisement dominates the street scene.
5. The large format advertisement panel would occupy a disproportionately large part of the gable end of No 201 and would appear markedly out of keeping with the smaller scale advertising that typifies the area. While the trees to the west would limit its visibility from a distance, in closer views from the west and during the winter months it would be highly discordant and visually intrusive due to its size and siting. This would be despite the absence of illumination.
6. Furthermore, the site falls firmly within the setting of the grade II listed School in Forster Place, which lies immediately to the south. This attractively

detailed red brick building dates from c1885, and on the basis of the evidence before me and my own observations, possesses high architectural and historic significance. Due to its size and nature, the proposed advertisement panel would visually compete with and detract from views of the western elevation of the listed building. As such, it would detrimentally compromise the setting of the listed building and affect the ability to appreciate its significance.

7. The appellant refers to a 1975 advertisement consent at the site, but that was a considerable time ago and there is no evidence before me of any large format advertisements being displayed at the site more recently.
8. I therefore conclude that the advertisement would cause significant harm to amenity. Whilst not decisive, the proposal also conflicts with Policies BD8 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) where they require signs to be sensitively located, and that proposals do not cause a loss of amenity. There is also conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (2014; Selective Review 2019) in so far as they seek to ensure that proposals are appropriate to their context, and conserve and enhance heritage assets. For the same reasons, there would also be conflict with the design and historic environment policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular paragraph 136 which sets out that poorly sited and designed advertisements can have a negative impact on the quality and character of places.

Conclusion

9. As set out above, I have found that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. For that reason, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR