



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/25/3376202

Local Garages Services Ltd, Henconner Lane, Bramley, Leeds LS13 4AD

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a part refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/04648/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is originally described as two digital illuminated free-standing signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for one digital illuminated free-standing sign designated as 'B' on the proposed site plan (ref: 19462 PA 04) and the proposed elevation plan (ref: 19462 PA 06). The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations and the following additional conditions:-
 - 1) The interval between successive displays shall be instantaneous (0.1 seconds or less), the complete screen shall change and there shall be no visual effects (including fading, swiping or other animated transition methods) between successive displays.
 - 2) The display shall not change more than once every 10 seconds. The use of message sequencing for the same product is prohibited and the advertisements shall not include features or equipment which would allow interactive messages or advertisements to be displayed.
 - 3) The screen display shall be erected with a mechanism installed in order that, if the screen display breaks down, it defaults to a blank black screen to avoid any flashing error messages or pixilation.
 - 4) The screen display panel shall at all times be fitted with a light sensor to adjust the brightness to changes in ambient light levels.
 - 5) At no time shall the luminance level of the signs exceed the thresholds contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) guidance document PLG05 – The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements 2015 (PLG 05) (or any subsequent amendment/replacement to this guidance).
 - 6) There shall be no special effects (including noise, smell, smoke, animation, flashing, scrolling, three dimensional, intermittent or video elements) of any kind during the time that any message is displayed.

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. This appeal stems from a split decision by the Council in respect of a proposal for two signs. The Council granted express consent for sign 'A' designated on the proposed site plan (ref: 19462 PA 03) and the proposed elevation plan (ref: 19462 PA 05), but refused consent for sign 'B' designated on the proposed site plan (ref: 19462 PA 04) and the proposed elevation plan (ref: 19462 PA 06). Accordingly, my decision concerns sign 'B' only.
4. 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 an amenity perspective, and I am satisfied that the sign would be acceptable in this respect.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The proposal relates to a free-standing 48-sheet digital display, fixed onto a hoarding within the forecourt of a commercial premises. The installation would be sited adjacent to Henconner Lane / A657 where it passes over Stanningley By-Pass / A647, and would be oriented to face southwards. A paper and paste display of comparable size and similarly directed is present on the opposite side of the highway.
7. The broadly northbound approach to the proposed advertisement on Henconner Lane is characterised by a series of signal-controlled junctions, including pedestrian crossing facilities. This arrangement manages traffic flow and naturally moderates vehicle speeds in the vicinity of the appeal site. From my observations, this section of the highway, which is subject to a 30mph speed limit, is predominantly level, straight and well-lit, with good forward visibility. The layout of lanes and associated permitted movements is also straightforward, including for traffic joining from the A647 off-ramp and from the Green Hill Road junction further to the south. No safety issues were apparent, a finding which aligns with the appellant's evidence.
8. The Council's concern centres on its view that the proposed display would be seen within the backdrop of signal heads as vehicles approach the A657 / A647 junction travelling along Henconner Lane. Traffic movements at this location are governed by four corresponding signal heads, and there are two controlled pedestrian crossings.
9. The approach to these signal heads includes a bend in the carriageway at its junction with Green Hill Road. This horizontal curvature prevents visibility of the proposed sign from the 90m stopping sight distance (SSD), as demonstrated in the appellant's evidence and confirmed by my own observations. Although the Council maintains that a 90-metre SSD represents the appropriate design standard for this

section of highway, it has not provided any substantive evidence to support its assertions regarding potential conflict between the respective installations at this location. The appellant's evidence further indicates that, because of the clear physical separation between them, the sign and the subsequent set of signal heads positioned just beyond it would not be intervisible at this SSD.

10. Queuing traffic ahead of the stop line is an inherent feature of signal-controlled junctions. I recognise that, for stationary or slow-moving vehicles, the display may briefly appear to sit behind the two signal heads positioned within the central pedestrian refuge. However, the substantial separation distance between the respective structures would mitigate any potential conflict between their displays and at no point on the approach to the junction would the display be seen in the background of the remaining two signal heads. There is no compelling evidence before me to show that these commonplace urban road conditions, in combination with the proposed display, would give rise to a particular safety concern at this location.
11. Given the well-lit urban streetscape and the presence of other advertisements in the vicinity, the illumination of the sequentially changing display would not create an unduly novel or prominent feature such to represent a hazardous distraction for road users. Its brightness would also be regulated in accordance with widely adopted standards.
12. For these reasons, I find that the proposed advertisement would not diminish the clarity or effectiveness of traffic signals encountered on its approach, nor would it give rise to confusion for motorists. Consequently, based on all the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the proposed sign would have a harmful effect upon public safety.
13. The Council's decision notice cites Policies P10 and T2 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (as amended 2019), Policies GP5 and BD8 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, guidance in the Leeds Advertising Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006 and Leeds Transport Supplementary Planning Documents, as well as paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework. I have taken into account these policies and guidance as material considerations, however, in line with the Regulations, they have not been determinative in my assessment of public safety.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested a series of additional conditions beyond the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations. These are comparable to the 'model conditions' set out within PLG 05 as referred to by the appellant and mirror those attached to the express consent granted by the Council for sign 'A'.
15. I consider conditions relating to the intensity and brightness of illumination and the means by which to control it, the types of images that should not be displayed, the refresh rate and transition methods for images are necessary and reasonable in the interests of amenity and public safety. I have therefore imposed conditions to this effect.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not be detrimental to the interests of public safety and therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Morrison

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 allowed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR