

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2026 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

### Decision by David M H Rose BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 April 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/25/3376726

#### Armley Business Park, 41-43 Stanningley Road, Leeds LS12 3LW

- 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 Mr Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/05129/ADV.
  - The advertisement proposed is erection of a 1no. 48-sheet billboard 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 Matters

3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety. Neither the Council nor any other party has raised any objection to the proposed advertisement from a public safety perspective, and I find no reason to disagree.
4. The Council's reason for refusal cites the impact of the proposal on nearby listed structures, but the statutory duty in section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is not engaged in an advertisement consent appeal. Under the Regulations, the assessment is limited to amenity and public safety. Even so, elements of historic interest can still be relevant when considering how the proposal affects amenity.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal proposal is for a 48-sheet paper and paste display board, fixed onto a hoarding positioned directly in front of a steel-clad wall which forms part of the boundary to the forecourt and parking area of a small business park. The installation would rise to the top of the wall and would be positioned beside a lamppost, close to the highway, facing oncoming east-bound traffic.

7. During my visit I noted that the business park contains a limited range of building-mounted and free-standing signs, as well as the presence of typical street lighting and traffic signal furniture. None of these commercial signs are located on the wall to which the proposal would sit against, and they are generally modest in scale whilst relating to the use of the premises. I note that there are large paper billboards further along Stanningley Road, however they are not visible from the appeal site and do not share its visual context.
8. Directly opposite the site is the entrance to Armley Park, which, together with surrounding commercial and residential properties, provides the locality with a mixed-use character. The park's entry is marked by listed stone gate piers set slightly back from the road, boundary walls and mature trees. Beyond the forecourt's steel-clad modern wall, larger brick and stone buildings provide a more traditional backdrop. Although separated by the busy Stanningley Road, these older features combine to create an attractively historic overall setting for the proposed advertisement, which remains the case despite the contrasting contemporary appearance of the adjoining business development and its signage.
9. The proposed installation would differ in nature, be positioned differently, and be significantly larger than the existing signage within the business park. I recognise that the billboard would not be digitised or illuminated. Nevertheless, by virtue of its substantial proportions and highly conspicuous positioning at the front edge of the forecourt, it would form an unduly dominant visual presence that would not be consistent with the appearance of the adjacent existing advertisements.
10. Furthermore, although partially seen alongside the commercial forecourt, the proposal would also be viewed together with neighbouring historic features and development, including the listed gate piers situated in proximity. Due to its siting and scale, the display would attract undue attention such to appear harmfully intrusive within this context, in doing so detracting from the qualities of the area which positively influence its character.
11. On this basis, I conclude that because of its size, prominence and its relationship with the wider street scene, the proposed advertisement would cause material harm to the amenity of the area. In so far as applicable to the main issue, I have taken into account the requirements of the Framework together with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended 2019), saved policies GP5 and BD8 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) and guidance in the Leeds Advertising Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006. Given the proposal would harm amenity, it would be contrary to their aims. I have therefore treated them as relevant material considerations, but they are not determinative in this appeal, which I have considered in accordance with the Regulations.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*A Morrison*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*David MH Rose*

INSPECTOR