



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by **L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/25/3371692

162 Briggate, Leeds LS1 6LY

- 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 Sheraz Ahmed against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02321/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is retrospective application for one illuminated fascia sign and one illuminated projecting sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. At the time of my site visit the advertisements were already in place, I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The appeal site is located within the Leeds City Centre Conservation Area (CA) and within the setting of the grade II* listed Time Ball Buildings, the grade II listed 2 Lamberts Arcade, the grade II listed 165A and 166-169 Briggate (the nearby listed buildings).
4. The Council also state the appeal building is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). However, no substantive evidence has been provided as to how the Council has reached that conclusion, particularly having regard to the guidance contained in Planning Practice Guidance¹. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not needed to explore this matter any further and have proceeded on the basis that the appeal building is not a NDHA as it would not have influenced the outcome of the appeal either way. I am, satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by my approach.
5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the advertisements on visual amenity having regard to their impact on the CA and the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

6. The internally illuminated fascia sign and the first floor level neon projecting sign are attached to a three storey building in a busy commercial part of Leeds City Centre and the CA. The nearby listed buildings are on the opposite side of the road. The appeal building is in commercial use at ground floor level, with the upper floors in residential use.

¹ Historic Environment Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723 Revision date: 23 07 2019

7. The expansive CA encompasses a significant part of the civic and commercial core of the city centre. It includes many fine Victorian and Edwardian buildings which reflect the City's industrial activity and commercial prosperity over time. Thus, insofar as is relevant to this case its significance is derived from the architectural detailing and arrangement of the buildings and streets within it. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal, the significance of the nearby listed buildings lies in their value as attractive examples of traditional commercial buildings, their traditional architectural detailing and their associated contribution to the street scene.
8. The fascia sign covers nearly the full width of the appeal property and is of considerable depth. It is much deeper than other signs nearby with brightly illuminated modern lettering. The large, illuminated lettering draws attention to what is, in my view, an overly bright, incongruous, dominating fascia sign which conflicts with the traditional architectural features of the traditional buildings within the CA failing to preserve its character and appearance. It follows that this conflict within the setting of the traditional nearby listed buildings within the CA is also harmful to the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
9. However, the projecting neon sign is more subtle. It's form reflects the character of the appeal building and through its scale and positioning is not out of place within the commercial context or alongside the traditional architectural detailing of the buildings in its vicinity. Even so, it is close to residential windows and bright, such that it inevitably has the potential to cause visual disturbance to residents occupying the upper floors of the appeal building if it is not sensitively operated. Nevertheless, had I been minded to allow the appeal I am satisfied these effects could be mitigated through appropriate planning conditions which could control its brightness and hours of illumination.
10. Thus, overall, for the reasons given I find the advertisements harm visual amenity having regard to their impact on the CA and the setting of the nearby listed buildings. The fascia sign also fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and harms the setting of the nearby listed buildings. For these reasons, even though not determinative, the proposal also conflicts with the aims of Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2014) (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and saved Policies GP5, BD6, BD7, BD8 and BD9 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006).

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given the appeal is dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR