
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2025

by S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/25/3362597
124-126 New Line, Bradford, BD10 0BX

- 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 Mr Paul Hardy (V2 LED Limited) against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00123/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is for a single LED illuminated advertisement in portrait format, measuring 2800mm high by 1920mm wide and comprising a pressed metal frame and a sealed LED screen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The local planning authority (LPA) has drawn my attention to the policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal. I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed static digital display would be in portrait format, about 2.8 metres high, 1.9 metres wide and with a depth of 0.2 metres. It would be sited at first floor level on the painted gable end of a two storey Victorian property in commercial use, located at a road junction. Individual letters would have a maximum height of 0.2 metres. It would be in a metal frame and where the internally lit advertisements would change remotely, with a proposed maximum illumination level of 5,000 cd/m², but which would reduce to 300 cd/m² at night. There is an existing fascia height sign advertising a coffee shop located within the building. The gable end, and therefore the proposed advertisement display, would be seen from some distance away when approaching along the A658. The appeal property is part of a cluster of mainly commercial buildings located close to the road junction. The signage in the area reflects the variety of commercial uses, generally advertising

their presence as opposed to being for general advertising. While some are lit, the overall ambit is a neutral one where no one advertisement stands out as dominating the area as a focal point.

5. The appellant has included photographs to show that the gable, virtually in its entirety, has previously been used in the past as an advertisement hoarding of the traditional paper based type, and I was able to see that this has been the case on my site visit.
6. The appellant has referred to many digital advertisements, both in Bradford and in other parts of the country, which he considers to have similar characteristics to the area of the appeal proposal. While that might be so, I have no detailed knowledge of their planning histories, nor of the detailed mix of land uses around them and only a general impression of the visual context of the areas, derived from the submitted photographs. These matters are not sufficient for me to draw conclusions concerning any precedents relating to consistency of decision making, and, in any event, I have determined the appeal based upon its individual merits.
7. My attention has also been drawn to a previous application for the installation of a digital advertisement on the gable, dismissed on appeal in 2020¹. The Inspector concluded that *'the digital illumination of the appeal proposal would result in a visually incongruous feature that would stand out from the other, more modest, advertisements in the area, dominate the street scene and be visible for some considerable distance along the road. This impact would be compounded by the intermittent changing of the illuminated display that would significantly draw the eye, further accentuating its visual prominence and harmful effect on the amenity of the area. Even if the brightness and the frequency of the advertisement were to be controlled by planning conditions, I consider that the form of the illumination and the intermittent display would be obtrusive'*.
8. However, the scale of that proposal was for a very much larger display, in landscape format, which covered much more of the gable of the building and would have had a much greater visual prominence than the current appeal proposal.
9. The LPA considers that the proposed sign would detract from the appearance of the gable which it considers has architectural features characteristic of the area. However, on my site visit I saw little evidence that such features on the gable were sufficiently important or prominent on their own as to justify a dismissal of the appeal.
10. Despite its much smaller size, the digital display, by its height on the building and its coloured and changing images, would still represent a dominating and over prominent focal point on New Line, introducing an over- assertive, obtrusive display where its visual prominence would contrast adversely with the more modest effects of other advertisements in the area, leading to harm to the visual amenities of the surroundings.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would be harmful to visual amenity and would conflict with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 which require good quality design and which reflect the character of the area. It would also conflict with paragraph 41 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended) and which notes that

¹ APP/W4705/Z/20/3254633

the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited.

12. Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR