



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2024

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/24/3349575

113-115 Legrams Lane, Bradford BD7 2AA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01701/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as conversion of poster advertisement to D48 advertising display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the advertisement applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The intensity of the luminance of the advertisement display shall be no greater than 300 candela per square metre at night (dusk until dawn).
 - 2) In daylight hours, the intensity of the luminance of the advertisement display shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions and shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out within the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements' (or its equivalent in a replacement Guide).
 - 3) The advertisement display shall only display static images and shall not display any moving images, animation, intermittent or full motion video images.
 - 4) No individual advertisement shall be displayed for a duration of less than 10 seconds.

Main Issue

2. The Regulations make clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council raises no objection on safety grounds, and I have no reason to take a different view. Thus, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

3. The proposed digital advertisement display would replace an existing poster billboard on the west-facing flank wall of 113-115 Legrams Lane. The evidence

suggests that the existing poster billboard has been present since at least 2008 and may therefore benefit from deemed consent.

4. I do consider that the digital display would be more eye-catching than the existing poster billboard by reason of the permanent digital illumination and sequential changing images. However, this would be within the context of the broad width of the road corridor, streetlights, and a range of commercial/retail sites and buildings, including the adjacent car park. Adverts of varying size and illumination are, in general, a common feature along this busy route into the city centre. The existing billboard is an established part of that character.
5. The proposed digital display would be framed against the end of the terrace in the same way as the existing billboard. Seen in the context of other commercial signage and within a busy and well-lit urban environment, it would not appear overly dominant or unduly conspicuous in this particular locality. Nor would it contribute to visual clutter or an unnecessary proliferation of signage given the present situation.
6. Therefore, subject to controls which could be put in place over the level of illumination and the speed and frequency of image transitions, I conclude that the proposed digital advertisement display would not cause material harm to the visual amenity of the area.
7. Although not decisive, the proposal also complies with the advertisement and general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017).

Conditions

8. In addition to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations, I have imposed conditions on illumination and on the duration, type, and transition between displayed images in line with what is proposed and to maintain the area's amenity.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR