



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Z/25/3372788

Land adjacent to 141 Leeds Road, Ilkley, West Yorkshire

- 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 City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01529/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of a freestanding D-Poster LED advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the erection of a freestanding D-Poster LED advertisement. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than within that recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals in its Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (or its equivalent in a replacement Guide).
 - 2) The internally illuminated display hereby approved shall include static images only. The interval between successive images shall be 0.1 seconds or less and the complete screen shall change. There shall be no visual effects between successive images, and the display shall include a mechanism to freeze or turn off the screen in the event of a malfunction. Each image shall be displayed for at least 10 seconds. Message sequencing or interactive messages shall not be used.

Main Issue

2. Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of visual amenity and public safety. The assessment regarding public safety is not disputed and the main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a strip of land between a terraced row of residential properties and commercial units, adjacent to the A65, Leeds Road on the approach into Ilkley. A group of mature trees run along the rear of the site, and these are protected by a group Tree Preservation Order. Beyond to the north is

residential development currently under construction. The area has a mixed character, and there are many other advertisements/signage in the vicinity of the site including existing commercial signage to nearby establishments.

4. The proposed development seeks to install a free-standing digital display poster. It would measure 3 metres by 6 metres and be 2 metres off the ground. It would sit in a prominent position adjacent to the footpath and highway and amongst a band of mature trees. I understand that the wider site to the west has historically hosted four paper and paste advertisement hoardings that have been replaced by a singular digital display of the same scale and design as that proposed.
5. Advertisement is therefore clearly a familiar feature on the strip of land in which the appeal site forms part of. Its overall scale and design would be consistent with that already on site. The digital display which is already in situ on the strip of land is of an illuminated nature and clearly visible when travelling along Leeds Road and thus forms part of the establish character of the area. The proposed advertisement would be consistent with this but on the opposite side of the strip of land which would face eastbound traffic on Leeds Road. The consolidation of advertising displays on this strip of land would continue to result in an overall reduction in displays and I do not find the appeal proposals to be anymore harmful.
6. The positioning of the proposed advertisement would be set against the verdant backdrop of the mature trees which has remained open. However, it would not totally impede views of the trees as these would still be visible above and around the proposed advertisement and there would still be a degree of openness and spaciousness surrounding the advertisements given the size of the strip of land and distance between both advertisements.
7. Having regard to the character of the locality, including the presence of various advertising displays, and existing commercial signage to nearby establishments, the proposed advertisement display would not appear out of keeping in this setting. It would replicate the existing digital display on the strip of land in an area that is clearly an established location for advertisements and signs.
8. The proposed advertisement would be internally illuminated. However, it would be no larger than the existing display to the west. It would not be overly dominant in a street scene where a variety of displays are commonplace. It would not therefore unduly stand out from the existing street scene nor impact the visual amenity of the area. Furthermore, the maximum brightness will always be within the guidelines as set by the institute of Lighting Professionals Technical Note 5. Appropriate conditions could control brightness, animation and the timing of image changes. The advertisement would not therefore be deemed significantly bright or flashing as to result in detrimental harm to visual amenity particularly when taking into account the existing character of the area. The area is also one which is well lit by streetlights etc and thus the level of illumination would not represent a dominant feature and would readily absorb into the street scene. In coming to such conclusions, I have had due regard to the existing advertisement to the west but do not find the cumulative effect to over dominate the street scene.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm visual amenity. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm visual amenity, the proposal would not conflict with the objectives

of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have been raised by interested parties regarding public safety. However, the Council's officer's report explains that there are no concerns in this regard subject to a condition controlling illumination and sequential change between advertisements to prevent distraction. This lack of concern from the Council is due to Leeds Road being relatively wide, well lit, straight and has good visibility. There is also a refuge island for pedestrian crossing and reduced speed limits during school drop off and pick up times. Based on the evidence before me and my own observations on site, I have no reason to disagree with the Council in relation to public safety matters.
11. As set out, there are residential properties currently under construction to the north of the site, but the properties are sufficiently shielded by the protected trees onsite. In the autumn and winter months when trees are not in leaf, there could perhaps be some intervisibility, but this would not be direct owing to the orientation of the advertisement and separation distances. I do not therefore raise concern in this regard.

Conditions

12. The five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations are imposed in the terms of my decision. In addition to these, I find it necessary to impose conditions controlling the brightness, animation and the timing of image changes as well as requiring the display to freeze in the event of any malfunction. These are imposed in the interests of public safety and amenity.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR