



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/24/3352836

Land At 406716 433316, Halifax Road, Denholme, Bradford BD13 4EX

- 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 Mandale Homes against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02149/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as “retrospective advertisement consent for 1 no. sign”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The original application was made retrospectively. I am satisfied that the submitted plans accurately reflect what has been installed. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the plans before me. The appeal seeks to retain the advertisement.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised during the life of the appeal. The substantive elements thereof as they relate to the appeal scheme have not changed. I am therefore satisfied that there is no need to seek the views of the main parties.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is situated in an open pasture field along a busy road, characterised by green hills and minimal signage, primarily limited to highway information. The site also lies in close proximity to the village of Denholme, however its immediate surroundings are open countryside.
7. The Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document (October 2008) identifies the appeal site as being within the Thornton and Queensbury Pennine Upland Landscape Character Area (LCA). Having regard to the available evidence,

I find that the LCA is primarily characterised as a pasture dominated landscape with stone wall boundary treatments. The area within which the site is located reflects these characteristics. While some man-made features such as overhead wires and lighting columns are present in proximity to the site, they do not unduly stand out within the landscape.

8. The advertisement is a large triangular freestanding sign located next to Halifax Road. Its height and width, while necessary for visibility, are atypical for the area. The sign adds visual clutter in the open countryside and dominates the surrounding space. The scale and design contrasts sharply with the natural environment, which the white frame structure exacerbates. Moreover, the colours used for the design do not assimilate into the natural green and brown surroundings. This results in a very prominent structure which disrupts the open, verdant and otherwise largely undeveloped character of the area. Although the advertisement is intended to be temporary to promote housing sales at Denholme, this is not sufficient justification to allow a proposal which has a harmful effect on amenity in this location.
9. Two nearby advertisements exist, one also promoting the Denholme project. Having regard to the available evidence, I am not certain whether these other advertisements have consent and thus represent a direct parallel to the appeal scheme. Other advertisements within the wider locality have been brought to my attention by the appellant. Again, limited information has been provided regarding these particular examples, though some of these signs appear located within commercialised areas of shopfronts and building structures and directly relate to the businesses they front. On the basis of the presented information, I do not consider that these examples are comparable to the appeal advertisement, and have therefore given them very limited weight.
10. Consequently, the appeal advertisement harms the amenity of the area. The appeal scheme conflicts with Policy DS1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document [Adopted July 2017] (CS), which emphasises good design quality. The appeal scheme also conflicts with CS Policy DS2, which aims to preserve open spaces and complement local context. Lastly, the appeal scheme conflicts with CS Policy EN4, which promotes landscape diversity in Thornton and Queensbury. I have taken these policies into account insofar as they are material in this case. As the appeal site is located in open countryside, I do not find conflict with CS Policy DS3, which refers to the urban character of the area, therefore is irrelevant to the appeal.

Other Matters

11. Concerns about public safety were raised by interested parties. However, the Council did not object to this appeal advertisement in this respect, and from the evidence before me, as well as my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR