
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/H/25/3373163

The Light, The Headrow, Leeds, LS1 8TL

- 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 Premier Vue Ltd against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02316/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is one non-illuminated banner sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of one non-illuminated banner sign at The Light, The Headrow, Leeds, LS1 8TL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02316/ADV, dated 9 April 2025. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. Various descriptions of the proposal have been provided with the planning application and appeal documents. I have taken the description from the Council's Decision Notice as I consider that accurately represents the proposal.
3. Powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. In my determination of this appeal the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area, with due regard to designated heritage assets.

Reasons

5. The proposal would be located on an elevation of The Light shopping centre, which contains a mixture of uses. Part of the building consists of the Grade II Listed Permanent House and Headrow Buildings. However, the proposed sign would be located on a modern part of the building which is not listed.
6. The modern building on which the sign would be placed is of a significant scale and massing, with shopfronts and associated signage on the ground floor and windows with a vertical emphasis on the upper floors. Although there is some variation in the design and proportions of the upper windows, their vertical

emphasis and relatively regular spacing introduce a rhythmical element into the arrangement of the fenestration on the upper part of the elevation.

7. However, that rhythm is disrupted at the point where the sign would be located, due to the placement of two much smaller false windows with an extent of blank façade above them, albeit that this is broken up to a degree by the detailing of panels. The Council contends that the reduction in the size of the windows at this point could be a device to reduce the scale of the elements making up the elevation to mediate the scale between the Listed Building and the larger modern extension. However, this part of the elevation does not successfully achieve this, and instead appears as an incongruous blank element of the façade with diminutive windows of a clumsy and jarring appearance.
8. The appellant submits that the visual break on this elevation was a design feature intended to provide advertising space, although the Council specifies that there is no evidence to support this. However, there has previously been consent for an externally illuminated plasma screen in this location granted in 2004, which was subsequently amended to a flex face screen of a similar scale to that currently proposed. The flex-face screen was in place for a number of years from at least 2008 until its removal in May 2018.
9. The proposed advertisement would respect the height of the taller windows on either side and would cover the current incongruous extent of blank façade and small false windows. There is also signage above the location of the proposed advertisement which establishes the principle of elevated signage in this location. Although the existing signage is of a much smaller scale compared to the appeal proposal and made up of individual letters, this nevertheless establishes the principle of elevated signage in this location. There are also elevated projecting signs on the elevation of the block facing The Headrow. Within this context, the proposed advertisement would appear as a logical and coherent addition to this elevation introducing an element of visual interest, and would represent an improvement compared to the current jarring and unsightly extent of blank façade and diminutive false windows.
10. The proposal is located close to the Grade II Listed Permanent House and Headrow Buildings, which are constructed of Portland stone and red brick in the Classical style. The classical design and use of materials contribute to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The proposed advertisement would be viewed within the setting of part of the Listed Building which returns around the corner of this city block. However, it would be viewed within the context of the substantial façade of a modern building, which is of a clearly different design than the Listed Building and is distinctly separate from it due to an inset of the façade. The host building is of limited architectural value and makes no contribution to the setting of the Listed Building. The proposed sign would assimilate within the façade of the host building, and due to its context and arrangement would not harm the setting of the Listed Building.
11. The appeal site is also located close to the Central Area - Leeds City Centre Conservation Area, and would be visible in views from the CA along the streetscape. The CA covers a significant part of the civic and commercial core of the city centre and includes many fine buildings that reflect the development of the city centre, and which contribute to the significance of this designated heritage asset. However, although the proposal would be visible from within the CA, the

views would be along the streetscape. Due to the relationship with the existing windows and its location on this modern building, the proposed sign would not be a strident or obtrusive feature in views from the CA. The proposal would therefore preserve the setting of the CA.

12. Although elevated signage of this scale is unusual in this area, due to the context of the existing modern façade, the improvement in the appearance of an unattractive element of the elevation, and mindful of the planning history of the site, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the amenity of the area. Insofar as they are material considerations, the proposal would not conflict with the design, arrangement and conservation requirements in respect of signage of Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy and Saved Policies GP5 and BD8 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. The proposal would also not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to the siting and design of advertisements. The proposal would also not conflict with the advice of the Council's Advertising Design Guide 2006, including in respect of site context and scale.

Other Matters

13. The Regulations require that I also assess the proposal in respect of the interests of public safety. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding public safety, and I note that the Highways consultee has raised no objections to the proposal. Based on what I have seen and read, I also conclude that the proposal would not harm public safety.

Conditions

14. As well as the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, the Council has suggested a further condition in respect of luminance levels. However, the proposal is for a non-illuminated banner sign, and on that basis a condition relating to luminance levels is not necessary.

Conclusion

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR