



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/Z/25/3374940**

**203 Carr House Road, Belle Vue, Doncaster, DN4 5DR**

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/01480/ADV.
  - The advertisement proposed is described as a 'Replacement D48 Display'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matter

2. 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 policies that the Council considers to be relevant to this appeal, those have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.

### Main issue

3. The main issues in this appeal are, therefore, the effect of the proposed advertisement on:-
  - amenity;
  - public safety.

### Reasons

#### *Amenity*

4. 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 development plan includes policy 49 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2015-2035) (LP) which seeks to ensure that advertisement proposals will be supported where they would not be the dominant feature of any location, leading to an excessive, visually cluttered or over bearing appearance.
5. The proposed sign would be an internally illuminated D48 digital display (height 3m, width 6m and depth 0.065m) that would replace an existing non-illuminated bill board of a similar size sited on the side elevation of a cycle retail unit at a

prominent corner of the busy A18 Carr House Road and Danum Road. The immediate surrounding area on this side of the dual carriageway comprises mainly commercial properties but the wider area is predominantly residential.

6. The Council's concerns relate to the proposed illumination rather than the size and scale of the sign and as this is similar to the existing billboard I would agree that it is acceptable in that regard.
7. With regard to illumination, although the appellant's light survey demonstrates that light spillage from the sign would not extend beyond the centre of Danum Road and would not extend to any of the nearby dwellings, the residential unit opposite that is above and at the rear of a hot food takeaway premises would have a view directly towards the proposed sign and it would also be seen from other dwellings on that side of the road, albeit obliquely. Despite the controls for brightness and the use of static rather than moving images, the illumination and changing images would have a much greater impact than the existing billboard and this would result in a significant loss of amenity for those occupiers in this mainly residential road.
8. When seen from Carr House Road, there are several commercial units that all have fascia signage. Two or three of those have illuminated signs. However, those are small in scale and the illumination from the proposed sign would be significantly larger and overly dominant. There are no illuminated signs on the building on which the sign would be positioned. The proposed illumination would be excessive in this context and would form the dominant feature of the area, resulting in visual clutter when dark.
9. I have noted the other examples referred to by the appellant but those differ from here because they have a different context in regards to the surrounding area. They do not, therefore, persuade me to alter my findings in this case. The proposed sign would, therefore, result in significant harm to the amenity of the area. It would conflict with the LP policy 49 and with the Framework in this respect.

#### *Public safety*

10. The PPG states that all advertisements are intended to attract attention, however, those proposed at points where drivers need to take more care are more likely to affect public safety. It advises further that the main types of advertisement which may cause danger to road users are those that are illuminated and those subject to frequent changes of the display.
11. The proposed sign would be located in the nearside position but within the view of drivers travelling in both lanes on the eastbound carriageway along Carr House Road and would be sited some 30m beyond a controlled pedestrian crossing and immediately adjacent to the Carr House Road / Danum Road priority T junction. The Council considers that the additional illumination and changing images would be a distraction for drivers, reducing their awareness of the crossing and presenting a danger to pedestrians. Although the appellant maintains that the Council's own Highways Officer raised no objection, his comments were subject to support from the Safer Roads team who did then object together with South Yorkshire Police.
12. The appellant's Highway Safety Report considers that due to the relatively straight alignment of the carriageway, approaching drivers would have good visibility and a clear sight line towards the proposed sign from at least 120m to the west of the site. It goes on to say that this is appropriate and in line with both Design Manual for

Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards and the Manual for Streets 2 (MfS2) stopping sight distance (SSD) for a 40mph road, and would give sufficient time for the presence of the sign to be assimilated without surprise.

13. The report shows that the position of the proposed sign and the locations of the nearside primary and offside secondary traffic signal heads for the pedestrian crossing would not interact in respect of approaching drivers in the nearside lane at the 82m stopping sight distance (SSD) (calculated in line with Manual for Streets 2 guidance) for the 40mph approach speed and considers that there would be no safety conflict.
14. However, I note that is not the case for the outside lane and whilst the report says that from the same SSD in that lane, the proposed sign and the locations of the offside primary and secondary traffic signal heads for the pedestrian crossing will not interact in respect of approaching drivers, it does not fully explain the drawing in Appendix B which shows that the nearside primary signal head would slightly overlap with the position of the sign in the drivers view. Although that would generally comply with DMRB guidance that at least one primary signal head is visible, it does not fully take into account the conditions of the road at this point. It does not refer to either the numerous accesses from dwellings on Carr House Road or to the layby that provides parking for several vehicles outside the commercial properties at nos 193-201, immediately before the pedestrian crossing. Those present additional vehicle movements of which approaching drivers must be aware, in addition to the pedestrian crossing and the junction with Danum Road.
15. In my judgment, therefore, even though illumination brightness would be within the Institute of Lighting Professional guidelines and the night time brightness would be generally lower than the luminance of the traffic signals, the proposal would, by reason of its sharp, vivid images and the movement created by the changing display, present a significant distraction to drivers even taking into account visibility and SSDs. The lack of evidence of accidents at this junction would not provide certainty that the development would not distract drivers because that data is based on the existing situation that does not include a changing, illuminated display.
16. The other examples cited are not directly comparable to this case which has a different context in regards to local highways conditions and do not, therefore, set a precedent for this case.
17. I conclude then, that the proposed sign would result in significant harm to public safety. This would be contrary to development plan policies 13 and 49 in the LP which together seek to ensure that development does not result in an unacceptable impact on public or highway safety.

### **Other matters**

18. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would ensure a number of benefits, including tidy and maintained sites with bio-diversity net gain where the site allows, an uplift in business rates to spend on public services, a reduction in vehicle trips and associated noise, air quality and climate benefits, the removal of multiple advertising sites and a reduction in clutter, a reduction in waste and better access to advertising displays for local businesses, the ability to broadcast emergency and public messaging and the opportunity to integrate additional hardware to meet the Smart City objective.

19. Whilst that might be the case, there is little substantive evidence of the benefits that would arise. In any case, those matters do not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused here.

**Conclusion**

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

*Sarah Colebourne*

Inspector