



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 10 April 2025

by **Jennifer Vyse DipTP MRTPI DipPBM**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/Z/25/3359863

Riverside Way Services, Sheffield Road, Rotherham S60 1DS

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mohammed Kaisali against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application No is RB2024/1455.
 - The advertisements proposed comprise the display of non-illuminated signage (signs 7, 8 and 9).
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A considerable number of illuminated and non-illuminated signs were proposed, as detailed on the application form. The Council issued a split decision. Consent was granted for all the signage proposed, other than signs 7, 8 and 9 as shown on Plan No 24-219 Rev5 (EG on the Move Sign Details & Elevations), which signage comprises a variety of non-illuminated window graphics. The appeal relates to those signs only. That is reflected in the description set out in the header above.
3. On visiting the site, it became clear that the submitted plans do not reflect the detail of the converted car showroom building as it now exists on site. As a consequence, whilst sign 8 could be displayed as shown, signs 7 and 9 could not. The windows the subject of sign 9 on the south elevation no longer exist, but in any event, approved signs 11, 12 and 13 have been installed in the area shown for sign 9. In addition, the shopfront glazing shown on the north elevation, which faces the jet wash bays, is no longer there. Rather, it is a solid elevation with three doors (as indicated by the floor plans). Notwithstanding those anomalies, I confirm that I have based my decision on the plans as submitted.

Main Issue

4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors.
5. There is no suggestion from any party that the advertisements proposed would have an adverse impact on public safety. I have no reason to disagree. The main issue in this case therefore, is whether display of the proposed signage would be contrary to the interest of amenity.

Reasons for the Decision

6. The appeal site occupies a prominent position within the western quadrant of the roundabout junction of the A630 (Centenary Way) with the A6178 (Sheffield Road). It includes a re-purposed car dealership building and petrol filling station. The building is now in use as a retail premises (Spar) which also serves the petrol filling station, plus some 'food-to-go units' (Sbarro, Greggs and Subway). A purpose built drive-through coffee shop is located within the southern portion of the site. Vehicular access to the site is from Riverside Way, off the A6178. Land on the opposite side of Riverside Way was being redeveloped at the time of my visit.
7. The proposed signage is on the re-purposed car showroom building. Sign 9, on the southern elevation, would face the drive-through coffee shop across a customer parking area. As shown on the submitted plans, the sign comprises graphics to three windows – two at high level and one lower down. Approved signage on this elevation comprises three, internally illuminated box signs each measuring 0.7 metres x 2.5 metres, at high level. Also visible on this elevation would be proposed sign 8, which comprises full shop window height graphics (measuring 2.6 metres x 3.1 metres) at ground level within the splayed, corner entrance to the building, plus an approved fascia sign above the doors (Sign 10).
8. The south elevation of the building, and the splayed corner, are clearly visible from the A6178 when heading north towards the roundabout and on entering Riverside Way. When seen together with the approved signage, proposed signs 8 and 9 would, both individually and cumulatively, overload the building elevations in visual terms, creating an appearance of clutter and excess, with consequential harm to amenity.
9. Proposed sign 7 is on the northern elevation of the building. The signage is shown as comprising full window height graphics across roughly a third of this elevation. Also visible on this elevation would be the fascia signage approved, but not installed (sign 10). I recognise that this elevation is not as visible from the surrounding highway network as the east and south elevations. Nevertheless, blocking out all the shop windows with advertising (a length of approximately 10 metres) would be disproportionate, overloading this elevation in visual terms, again with consequential harm to amenity.
10. For the reasons set out above, I find that the proposed advertisements would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area. There would be conflict, in this regard, with policy SP60 of the Rotherham Local Plan (June 2018) insofar as it seeks to protect amenity and so is material in this case. There would be conflict too with paragraph 141 of the Framework, also a material factor, which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR