



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/22/3312164

12 Otley Road, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8AH

- 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 Mrs Sara Ralph (Bellissima Exclusive) against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/05024/ADV, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2022.
 - The advertisements proposed are described as '2 signs on the gable end of our building with an existing light above'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed advertisements were in place at the time of my site visit and so I was able to see them in context with the surrounding area.
3. 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.

Main Issue

4. The Council has not raised any concerns on public safety grounds and I have no reason to take a different view. Thus, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the advertisements on amenity, with due regard to the Guiseley Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is part of a traditional stone-built terrace in a comprehensive shopping parade that extends along the north side of Otley Road. It also lies within the Guiseley Conservation Area (the GCA), most of which dates from the mid-19th century onwards and reflects the industrial heritage of the area. The Guiseley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2012 identifies the appeal site and its immediate neighbours as positive buildings within the GCA. However, it also warns that poorly designed advertisements are among the negative features which detract from the architectural integrity of the historic buildings and the special character of the GCA. This reflects my own observations.
6. The appeal building contains modern shopfronts with large fascia signs, a projecting box sign above the fascia, and window decals in all of the first floor

windows, albeit the lawfulness of those belonging to the separate hair studio are questioned by the appellant. In marked contrast, the adjoining building to the west, shown as No 18 on the submitted location plan, is almost without advertisements apart from a modest sign above the side entrance door, and is particularly notable for its rich architectural detailing.

7. The appeal signs are not part of the main shopfront. Instead, they occupy a disproportionately large part of the narrow side wall/gable where it projects forward of No 18, and as a result, are highly conspicuous in views from the west. Through their size, prominence, and use of modern materials, they do not harmonise with the traditional character of the host building and have a jarring effect with No 18. They also add considerably to the overall clutter of advertisements on the building. Consequently, both alone, and cumulatively with other signage on the building, the advertisements are negative features which diminish the contribution made by the host building and its immediate neighbour to the GCA.
8. Whilst an advertisement may have been displayed on this part of the building in the past, there is little evidence to demonstrate that the appeal signs are less harmful, so I attach minimal weight to this matter.
9. I have noted the appellant's concerns in relation to other advertisements in the area. However, this is not justification for harmful advertisements at the appeal site. I have necessarily considered the appeal on its individual merits and I have found that the advertisements are harmful for their own reasons. It is for the Council to address any questions regarding the other signage that the appellant has highlighted.
10. I therefore conclude that the advertisements are detrimental to the interests of visual amenity. Whilst not decisive, there is also conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (Selective Review 2019), as well as Policies BD8, BD9 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). When read together, these policies require development, including signage, to be well designed, respect the character and quality of surrounding buildings, and to safeguard the historic environment. Further, paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that poorly sited and designed advertisements can have a negative impact on the quality and character of places.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to the economic benefits of the advertisements, but as set out above, my assessment of the appeal scheme is limited to the interests of amenity and public safety.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the display of the advertisements is detrimental to the interests of amenity, and for that reason, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR