



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/Z/25/3364743

747 Manchester Road, Linthwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5QQ

- 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 Ltd against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/64/90034/W.
 - The advertisement proposed is one digital advertisement display (D-Poster).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of an existing forecourt of a motor vehicle repair garage. It is situated within the Linthwaite Conservation Area (CA). The CA covers a relatively large geographical area and, consequently, its character and appearance varies.
4. The site situated on a busy main road and within an area containing a mixture of business and residential uses. Buildings vary in their scale and appearance. Advertising is commonplace in the locality and mainly includes fascia and projecting signs. These tend to relate to the commercial uses within the buildings and they are an established part of the character and appearance of the CA. During my site visit I also observed a large paper pasted display on a neighbouring forecourt area.
5. The proposal is to erect a digital advertisement display on the northern end of the forecourt, close to the road frontage. It would sit in front of a tree covered embankment. I consider that the trees and other greenery make a positive contribution to the streetscene and to the appearance of the CA.
6. The proposed display would be 6m wide and 3m high and positioned 1.9m above the ground. It would show static images displayed on rotation. Controls, timers, and light sensors would be installed, which would accord with guidance provided by the Institute of Lighting Professionals.
7. The Council considers that the proposal would be intrusive and incongruous within the streetscene and would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA.

The Council refers to a conflict with Policies LP24 (a), LP25 1 (a) and (b) and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan. These policies are not determinative, as proposals for Advertisement Consent are determined solely in relation to amenity and public safety. Nevertheless, the policies assist in understanding the Council's reasoning.

8. Notwithstanding the presence of the nearby paper pasted display (which, in my opinion, does not make a positive contribution to the area), the appeal proposal would appear overly dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene. It's overall size and method of display would be uncharacteristic and alien in the locality and the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the CA. Whilst, in heritage terms, this harm would be less than substantial, any public benefits, including the ability to broadcast emergency and public messages would not, in my opinion, outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. In reaching my decision, I have also considered the suggested conditions put forward by the appellant. However, I am not persuaded that they would provide sufficient mitigation to make the proposal acceptable.
10. I have noted the various decisions that the appellant has submitted and considers to be comparable to the appeal proposal. These relate to different towns and different parts of the country and therefore, they do not attract any significant weight in my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR