
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/Z/25/3373895

Petrol Filling Station, Barnsley Road, Wakefield WF2 6BH

- 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 Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01121/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of a D6 small format advertising display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The control of advertisements is exercisable only with respect to public safety and amenity. Regulation 3 states that powers in this regard shall be exercised taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. Therefore, whilst the policies of the development plan referred to by the Council in its decision are not on their own determinative, I have taken them into account as a material consideration.
4. In this case neither the Council nor any other party has raised any objection to the proposal in relation to public safety. From the evidence before me, and my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree.
5. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out, amongst other things, that amenity is usually the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement, and the local characteristics of the neighbourhood should always be considered.
7. The appeal site comprises a petrol filling station (PFS) situated on a well-trafficked route to the south of Wakefield. As is typical of a PFS, the forecourt contains a

range of advertisements, including an illuminated totem, several fixed and freestanding non-illuminated signs, and banner displays. While signage is prevalent within the site, and there are also advertisements close by at the neighbouring public house, digital poster displays are not a feature of the forecourt, nor are they characteristic of the wider street scene which has a low presence of advertisements beyond the PFS and public house. The prevailing character around these premises is leafy and suburban.

8. Two Grade II listed buildings, Walnut Cottage and 2–6 Standbridge Lane, are situated close to the PFS. The listed buildings derive their significance primarily from their traditional form and architectural detailing, including coursed stone construction, stone-flagged roofs, and multi-pane sash windows, which reflect the area's development during the 17th and 18th centuries. These heritage assets form part of the area's prevailing traditional vernacular. The overriding suburban character of the surroundings of the PFS positively contributes to their setting.
9. Even accounting for the existing advertisements, signage and lighting on the forecourt and in the wider area, the proposed advertisement would appear incongruous within the suburban context. This is due to its prominent siting at the PFS entrance, adjacent to the footway on Barnsley Road, and its overtly contemporary design, which includes digital illumination. It would be particularly noticeable given its position against the backdrop of the nearby traditional buildings at Walnut Cottage, detracting from the listed building's setting. This would be pronounced further when intervening vegetation is cut back or not in leaf. The visual impact would also be exacerbated by the intermittent changing of the display, which would further draw the eye.
10. Despite apparently being primarily aimed at PFS users, the advertisement's perpendicular alignment to the road would make the identified harm to the amenity of the area highly visible to drivers and pedestrians travelling in the direction of Standbridge Lane. For these passersby, the existing totem would only impede views of the display from a short section of pavement nearest the PFS.
11. Although conditions could regulate brightness and intervals between changing images, these measures would not alter the prominent siting, contemporary aesthetic, or the fundamental nature of the proposal, which is designed to attract the attention of passersby and would appear discordant with the prevailing suburban character of this part of Barnsley Road. Due to their narrow profile and understated appearance, the visual effects of the existing streetlamp and telephone mast which sit next to the appeal site are not comparable.
12. The proposed advertisement would therefore have a harmful effect on the amenity of the area. Insofar as they are material, it would also conflict with Policies SP23, LP56, LP61, LP63, LP64, and LP65 of the Wakefield District Local Plan Volume 1 Development Strategy, Strategic and Local Policies (2024) which amongst other things require advertisements to respect the character of the locality and any features of scenic, historic, architectural, cultural, or other special interest and seek to ensure the district's historic assets are conserved and that distinctive local characteristics are recognised.
13. My conclusion also reflects the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which advises that the quality and character of places can be undermined where advertisements are poorly sited or designed.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has drawn my attention to the benefits of digital advertisements such as the provision of tidy and well-maintained sites; increased flexibility; uplift in business rates; reduction in waste and vehicular trips; the ability to allow for public messaging and art campaigns; and the capability to meet Smart City objectives. In any case, there is nothing to suggest the proposal before me is the only way to achieve such benefits and in this instance, they do not justify the harm to amenity.
15. While I note the examples provided by the appellant of other digital advertisements that have been granted consent, I am unaware of the precise circumstances in those cases which are in any case unlikely to be identical to those before me and the site-specific harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR