



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/23/3316452

Land at Carlisle Road, Carlisle Grove, Pudsey LS28 8PR

- 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 22/07657/ADV, dated 14 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 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.

Reasons

4. The large poster display panel would stand within a small area of grass verge on the west side of Carlisle Road, immediately outside The Royal public house, which is an attractively detailed, traditional stone building located prominently at the corner of Carlisle Road with Station Road. On the opposite side of the road is a commercial unit featuring an array of signage on the roadside elevation and fencing, but otherwise the street scene along this part of Carlisle Road is residential in character.
5. Though the poster display panel would be sited nearly parallel to the road, I saw that it would still be visible over some distance along Carlisle Road, particularly from the north. In the longer views it would stand out in marked contrast to the residential context it would primarily be experienced in, such that it would be highly incongruous. When viewed closer up it would be a dominant feature along the pavement and would have a jarring visual relationship with the traditional building it would be seen alongside. The background trees along Carlisle Grove and an absence of illumination would not lessen these harmful effects. Furthermore, in combination with the existing

signage opposite, the proposal would result in an excessive proliferation of advertisements in this location, to the further detriment of the street scene.

6. 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 Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (2014; Selective Review 2019) where it seeks to ensure that proposals are appropriate to their context. For the same reasons, there would also be conflict with paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out that poorly sited and designed advertisements can have a negative impact on the quality and character of places.

Conclusion

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

A Caines

INSPECTOR