



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/25/3373985

Karmand Community Centre and Premises, Barkerend Road, Bradford BD3 9EP

- 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 for the display of an advertisement.
 - The appeal is made by Karmand Community Centre against the decision of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02831/ADV.
 - The development is described as a digital screen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated along a busy main road that accommodates a variety of uses and building forms. The proposed screen would be mounted on the side elevation of a relatively large community building that already presents a substantial visual presence within the streetscene.
4. Directly opposite is a landscaped area forming part of a primary school frontage, which introduces a more open and softer character to this section of the road. Moving eastwards, the streetscene transitions to a predominantly residential character, albeit with further school buildings facing the highway. To the west, the character shifts again, with larger institutional buildings, such as a church and a former school, before giving way to a more mixed residential and commercial area.
5. The proposed advertisement would directly face the side elevation of 1 Silkstone Street. While the ground floor of this property accommodates a commercial use, the first-floor side windows serve a residential unit. The appellant states these windows serve a kitchen, bathroom and living room, and confirms that the living room has a dual aspect view with another window facing Barkerend Road. Whilst the intervening landscaping may provide some degree of screening, the illuminated digital screen, with its changing imagery, would be a prominent feature to the occupants of the residential accommodation.
6. Although the proposed digital screen would replace an existing smaller non-digital advertisement, the introduction of an illuminated digital screen in this location would

represent an incongruous addition to a part of the streetscene that, despite its functional diversity, retains a generally coherent and established character. The scale, illumination, and changing imagery of the proposed screen would draw undue visual attention and would not integrate successfully with the more subdued and varied built forms nearby, particularly those of a residential nature.

7. In assessing amenity, I have taking into account the existing advertisements in the at the appeal site and within the surrounding area. Notwithstanding this the proposed advertisement would add to the visual clutter which would detract from the amenity of the area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to another digital advertisement in Leeds which is turned off during the night. I have not been provided with substantive details other than a photograph to compare this to the proposal before me. However, turning the digital display off during certain hours would not alleviate my concerns. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
9. I conclude that the display of the digital advertisement proposed would harm the amenity of the area.
10. I have taken into account Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) which seeks amongst other things that developments are of good design and are appropriate to the surrounding area. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
11. I find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements.

Other Matters

12. The appellant highlights a range of potential advantages associated with modern digital advertising formats, including the ability to operate the display remotely without the need for routine site visits. This, it is argued, forms part of a wider industry movement towards the modernisation advertising infrastructure. While digital displays may offer operational efficiencies and can be installed using contemporary, lightweight, and durable materials, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that these industry trends would deliver any direct or meaningful benefits to the amenity of the appeal site or its surroundings.
13. The appellant also refers to the digital screen's capability to broadcast emergency messaging, as well as its potential use during void periods for non-commercial content. Although such uses may be technically possible, the proposal before me is for a commercial advertisement display. No mechanism, guarantee, or enforceable condition has been proposed to ensure that such public-interest content would be provided in practice, nor is there evidence to show how frequently or effectively these features would be utilised.
14. Additional claims relate to opportunities for more creative, real-time, and locally relevant advertising, as well as the potential integration of additional hardware to support broader "Smart City" objectives. The appellant also suggests that the

screen could promote Bradford City of Culture initiatives and disseminate information on local employment, education, sports, and training opportunities. While these aspirations may reflect the versatile capabilities of digital technology, they remain speculative in the absence of clear commitments or supporting evidence. Moreover, these potential advantages do not alter the fundamental requirement that advertisement proposals must be assessed with regard to their impact on amenity and public safety.

15. In this context, and consistent with the relevant Regulations¹, the Framework², and Planning Practice Guidance³, the wider operational, cultural, or technological benefits claimed by the appellant do not outweigh the identified harm to the amenity.

Conclusion

16. The appeal is dismissed and express consent is refused for the digital screen as applied for.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ Regulation 3(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

² Paragraph 141

³ Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 18b-026-20140306