



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2026

by K Craddock BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/Z/25/3375792

248 Car Park At Humberstone Road, Leicester LE5 0EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 20251258.
 - The development proposed is “replacement D48 display”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 identifies that the power 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. Therefore, while I have taken account of the policies that the Council considers to be relevant, these have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.
3. Whilst the policies are not determinative I note the emerging Local Plan is close to adoption and I attach significant weight to it.
4. The appeal relates to the removal of 4no. non-illuminated advertisement boards (48-sheet) and the installation of 2no. illuminated digital displays (48-sheet).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed digital advertisements on the amenities of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located on the north side of Humberstone Road in front of a mixed industrial use site. Immediately to the south side of Humberstone Road is a planned residential area comprising mainly flats with some terraced housing. The surrounding environs contain a combination of industrial uses, retail and housing. Development in the locality is generally two-storey in height.
7. Humberstone Road is a heavily trafficked route and provides a distinct line of separation between the appeal site bordering the industrial area to its north and the residential area to its south. The housing is set back from Humberstone Road

behind a substantial grassed area, an incomplete row of mature trees, two small car parking areas for residents and an estate road called Dunlin Road.

8. The appellant has confirmed the screens would be illuminated 24 hours a day with a static image changing six times per minute. Approximately 90 metres to the west along Humberstone Road, an existing illuminated advertisement of similar dimensions and operating conditions was evident at the time of my site visit and provided a useful comparison for the likely effect of the proposed advertisements upon this area.
9. The most southerly digital display would be located directly opposite Flats 19-24 Redwing Walk, which is located on Dunlin Road. It was evident from my site visit that a number of flats had windows looking directly onto the proposed digital screen. Due to the intervening space containing one of the residents' car parks, there are no trees to mitigate the impact and the view from these windows would be unfettered.
10. The most northerly digital display would sit directly opposite 33 Dunlin Road and be visible from the windows in the front elevation. Whilst the trees provide some mitigation, this would only be the case when the trees are in leaf and it was evident from my site visit that the canopy of the trees would not sit low enough to obscure all the digital screen.
11. I visited the site during daytime and nighttime hours. During the evening visit the difference in character between the housing area and Humberstone Road was pronounced, with the housing being dark and restful in nature despite the proximity of Humberstone Road. The presence of the illuminated screens, operating throughout the day and night, combined with their closeness to the identified residential properties, would be a harmful visual addition to the streetscene and character of the area.
12. I noted from my site visit that the existing hoardings also provide mitigation from the nighttime illumination of the industrial site behind the displays. Were the hoardings to be removed, it could allow further light seepage to have a negative visual effect on the area.
13. As a result of the above matters, the proposed advertisements would result in unacceptable harm to the visual character of the streetscene due to the incongruous nature of the illumination and their relationship to the residential properties on Dunlin Road and Redwing Walk.
14. In terms of the siting, mass and height of the proposed advertisements, I find no particular harm on these matters alone as the digital screens would be of a comparable size and location to the existing non-illuminated signs that they would replace. As the proposed 2no screens would result in less mass than the existing 4no boards, I find there would be less visual clutter under the proposals.
15. The appellant has drawn my attention to other similar advertisements nationwide, including an appeal decision relating to a different local authority area. Whilst I have taken these into account, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these other cases and, in any event, each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits.

16. I acknowledge the appellant's assertion that the proposals would provide a number of benefits, such as the reduction of clutter and reduction in use of paper-based resources, amongst others, to which I give some weight. Nevertheless, given the visual impact upon the streetscene and the area, these benefits would be limited and I have not been presented with evidence that they could not be achieved elsewhere without the harm I have identified. As a result, these matters are insufficient to outweigh that harm.
17. As such, whilst it is not determinative, I find conflict with policy CS3 of the Leicester City Council Core Strategy (2014) and policy DQP10 of the emerging Leicester Local Plan (2020-2036), which seek, amongst other matters, for new development to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local built environment and permit advertisement hoardings where they will screen derelict sites.
18. I have also taken into account paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which explains that advertisements which are poorly designed and sited can have a negative impact on the appearance of the quality and character of places. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the advertisements demonstrate a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the streetscene and the wider area and, as such, the proposal conflicts with paragraph 141 of the Framework.

Other Matters

19. The appellant has suggested that conditions could be imposed to limit the luminance and type of image displayed on the screens. Whilst such measures may help reduce the extent of visual impact, they would not fully overcome my concerns about the harm caused by the proposal.

Conclusion

20. The advertisements do not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
21. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

K Craddock

INSPECTOR