



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/Z/25/3372279

10 Clay Lane, Edenthorpe, Doncaster, DN2 4RX

- 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 LEDSynergy against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01354/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'the installation of 2 x new LED advertising signs'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form states that the applicant was LEDSynergy and whilst it may be that this was an error given that the appeal form refers to Lotan Group, the appeal must proceed under the name given on the application form. The appellant has been notified of this.
3. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) reiterate this approach. Therefore, while I have referred to a policy that the Council considers to be relevant to this appeal, this has not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.
4. Although the appellant has offered during the course of the appeal to amend the size of the signs to 4m by 2m, that is a material change which the Council and other parties have not had the opportunity to comment upon. I must therefore consider the appeal on the basis of the plans as submitted.

Reasons

5. The main issue in this appeal is, therefore, the effect of the proposed advertisements on amenity. The advertisement regulations state that factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality. The Framework says that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited. The most relevant policy in the development plan is policy 49 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 (adopted 2021) which says that advertisements and signage should respect the character of the area and not be the dominant feature of any location.
6. The proposal would consist of two internally illuminated digital advertising boards of some 2.88m high, 5.76m wide and a depth of 0.35m, mounted on a 1m base with

an overall height of 3.88m. They would promote the services of a clinic and would be sited on a piece of vacant, overgrown land that is located between dwellings on a bend at the corner of Clay Lane and Thorne Road which are both residential roads on the edge of a traditional, low-density suburban residential area.

7. In the wider area, on the opposite side of the very busy multi-lane A18 and the Shaw Lane roundabout, is a large area of retail and commercial uses with associated signage and advertisements. However, the appeal site is set back some 80m or so from there and separated by deep grass verges, mature tree planting and the carriageways of both Clay Lane/Thorne Road and the wide A18.
8. The immediate context is therefore one of residential character. In both short range views from Clay Lane and Thorne Road and in longer range views from the A18, the advertisements would be seen set between the long frontages of the two storey semi-detached dwellings. This residential context is not appropriate for the siting of advertisements even if their size and scale were reduced. Furthermore, the size, scale, illumination and changing display of the proposed signs would exacerbate the impact of their inappropriate siting. They would form an overly dominant, commercial feature which would significantly detract from and harm the character of this residential area, contrary to development plan policy 49. The appellant's suggested conditions to control brightness and hours of operation in accordance with guidelines set out by the Institution of Lighting Professionals in PLG05 (The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements) would not mitigate this harm sufficiently.
9. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would make the area feel more modern and invested in but I have no substantive evidence of the likelihood of that and in any case, that matter does not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused by this proposal.

Conclusion

10. I conclude then that the proposal would result in significant harm to amenity and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector