



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by **C Walker BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/Z/25/3360707

57 Humberstone Road, Leicester LE5 3AN

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 20242014.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'Conversion of 1no. poster advertisement to D-Poster.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council does not object to the proposed advertisement on public safety grounds, and I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a strip of land between the building on the appeal site and the adjacent pavement, where low level planting separates the site from the highway. Located in a prominent position, it sits next to the western side gable of a commercial garage building, facing a large, signalised roundabout, forming part of a major arterial route into and out of the city. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial with retail units close by. In addition to the corporate signage on the commercial units themselves, there is also a freestanding sign adjacent to Lidl across the roundabout. An existing backlit paper display is in situ at the appeal site, which the advertisement the subject of this appeal is proposed to replace.
4. The proposed advertisement would be seen alongside the adjacent commercial building occupied by Mash Auto's. Due to its height, the hoarding would visually compete with this building, projecting above the adjacent roof such that this advertisement would be dominating and jarring to the visual amenity of the area. This would be exacerbated by the vertical form of the hoarding which clashes with the more horizontal form of the building. Therefore, due to its excessive size and form, the proposed advertisement would be a harmful, unduly prominent feature in the street-scene and would be unsympathetic to nearby built form.
5. Whilst illumination would exacerbate the harm arising from the size and form of the hoarding, I do not find that illumination in itself would be harmful here. Likewise, the sign would replace the existing display and would sit alongside a context of

signage appropriate to its commercial context. It would not be seen in the same landscape as other freestanding advertisements, such that the street-scene would not appear overtly cluttered. Consequently, I do not find that the proposal would cause cumulative harm through visual clutter. Nevertheless, this would not overcome the harm that I have identified.

6. Details of existing displays within the vicinity of the site and what the appellant considers to be comparable advertisements have been drawn to my attention. Unlike the appeal proposal, from the limited information provided, the examples brought to my attention do not compete or dominate the buildings or context they sit alongside. As such, none of the examples provided are directly comparable to the appeal before me. Therefore, they do not alter my conclusions on the harm in this instance.
7. The appellant has also referred to the ability to control levels of illuminance and the nature of changing images by condition. However, such conditions would not overcome my fundamental concerns regarding the size of the display and its relationship with nearby built form.
8. Notwithstanding my findings on cumulative impacts, due to its size and siting, the proposed advertisement would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area. The proposal runs counter to paragraph of 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
9. Insofar as is relevant to the matters of amenity, I have had regard to policies in the development plan. The proposal would conflict with Policy 3 of the Leicester City Core Strategy (2014) which expects high quality design and well-designed development that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the built environment, responds positively to the surroundings and is appropriate to the local setting and context.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed advertisement would have an unacceptable effect on amenity.

Other Matters

11. The benefits of digital advertising have been set out by the appellant. These include decluttering and a consolidation of advertisements through the likely reduction in demand for other sites due to the capabilities of displaying 6 campaigns at a time. I acknowledge that the advertisement could bring about positive benefits to the local economy. However, the regime of advertisement control has a limited scope and is exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety. Furthermore, there is no evidence in this case that other advertisements would be removed. So this does not alter my findings in relation to the effect on amenity.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the display of the advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

C Walker

INSPECTOR