
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

Decision by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/Z/25/3375202

100 St Anns Road, Eastwood, Rotherham S65 1PN

- 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 Ednan Karim against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2025/1088.
 - The advertisement proposed is LED Billboard - 6x3 (approx. 48 sheet).
-

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 Matter

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, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. Therefore, whilst the development plan policies referred to in the Council's decision cannot by themselves be decisive, where relevant I have taken them into account as a material consideration.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity and public safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Visual amenity

5. The appeal site comprises the flank wall of a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling, facing a busy roundabout. Despite the edge of the town centre location, existing advertisements in the vicinity of the appeal site are limited to fascias and other small-scale signage associated with businesses along Fitzwilliam Road, a small number of modest sized sponsorship displays on the roundabout and a supermarket totem at the Centenary Way turnoff. The scarcity of large-scale, digital

advertisements gives the area an uncluttered appearance that contributes positively to visual amenity.

6. Due to its size and elevated position, the proposed billboard would be highly visible to passersby travelling along Fitzwilliam Road, as well as to drivers and pedestrians approaching the roundabout from the northern branch of St Anns Road. In the absence of any similar advertisements in the vicinity, the prominent siting of the proposal, combined with its digital illumination and sequential images, would result in an incongruous feature that would harmfully detract from the domestic scale of the appeal site and the uncluttered appearance of the wider area.
7. Consequently, the proposed advertisement would cause harm to visual amenity. In this regard, and although they have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal, the proposal would not accord with the aims of Policies SP55 and SP60 of the Rotherham Local Plan – Sites and Policies (2018) which require proposals to positively contribute to local character and distinctiveness of an area, and that advertisements do not contribute to a loss of amenity. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework advises that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited, which would be the case here.

Public safety

8. The Planning Practice Guidance states that all advertisements are intended to attract attention, with those proposed at points where drivers need to take more care are more likely to affect public safety. It advises that the main types of advertisement which may cause danger to road users are those which are illuminated, which could be mistaken for, or confused with, traffic lights and those subject to frequent changes of the display. Moreover, those which, because of their size or siting, would obstruct or confuse a road-user's view, or reduce the clarity or effectiveness of a traffic sign or signal can also pose a risk to highway safety.
9. The roundabout contains multiple traffic signals, including two signalised pedestrian crossings adjacent to the appeal site. Due to its scale, elevated position, prominent siting and close proximity to the highway, the proposed billboard would be highly conspicuous to drivers negotiating the roundabout, particularly on approach to Fitzwilliam Road and the northbound turn off onto St Anns Road, and would introduce a significant source of distraction at a critical point where they must respond accurately to traffic signals.
10. While the proposal might not obstruct traffic signals, sightlines and pedestrian crossings, the intermittent changing of the digital display, albeit instantaneous, would have the potential to not only distract motorists but also cause visual confusion between the lights and the digital display in their backdrop. This would increase the risk of conflict to drivers and pedestrians, as they navigate this busy roundabout.
11. For these reasons, the proposed advertisement would be harmful to public safety.

Other Matters

12. I note that conditions could be imposed to limit luminance, control frequency of image changes, prevent moving or flashing content, and restrict hours of operation of the proposal. Nonetheless, such measures would not sufficiently mitigate its

incongruous appearance or the inherent public safety risk associated with a large, elevated, LED display in this prominent roadside location.

13. Similarly, even if the proposed advertisement would be mounted flush to the gable wall and there would not be any significant consequences for the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings, this would not mitigate or outweigh the harm I have identified with regard to visual amenity and public safety.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

F Harrison

INSPECTOR