



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/Z/25/3375494

Space Station Self Storage Limited, Doncaster Road, Kirk Sandall, Doncaster DN3 1HE

- 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 Space Station Self Storage Ltd c/o agent against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01473/ADV.
 - The advertisements proposed are 11 new advertising signs.
-

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 Matters

3. The description above is taken from the covering letter dated 18 July 2025 which is referred to by the application form. Several, but not all of the advertisements have been added to the building. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies relevant to the appeal and I have taken them into account as material considerations. Power to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety under the above regulations. The policies alone have not therefore been decisive.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on amenity and public safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Amenity

5. The appeal site comprises a very large scale block type industrial building that dominates the street scene. It is in use as a self-storage facility. There is a supermarket close by and dwellings are opposite. Both the appeal building and the supermarket are set back a considerable distance from the roadside. Adverts in the area, including both commercial premises, are very limited and as such recessive

in the street. This and a lack of clutter, despite the scale of the appeal building in isolation, gives the area a pleasant sense of understated spaciousness.

6. The total number and new location of some (to the side elevations particularly) signs would negatively draw the eye and noticeably increase the visual prominence of what is a structure of significant scale in context. The sense of increased obviousness will be particularly acute for the residents living opposite and during hours of reduced daylight given the extent of new 'always on' illumination. I appreciate this could be turned off during nighttime hours, but this would not be sufficient given the number of darker days over the autumn and winter.
7. The proposed totem would be of significant height and sited close to the back edge of the highway. Its bright colour, double sided design and extent of illumination would make it highly prominent. It would dominate the street scene over and above the structure located further down the road outside the supermarket. It would add to the clutter of the number of signs proposed as the remainder of the scheme and unacceptably erode the spaciousness of the street scene. With this and the above in mind, the proposed signage would cause harm to the amenity of the area through unacceptable proliferation. It would be contrary to the aims of Policy 49 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2021 (LP) as far as they are material to the main issue and concerned with advertisements respecting the character and appearance of an area amongst other things.

Public Safety

8. Doncaster Road is a main route through Kirk Sandall. The area is well used by both pedestrians and vehicles. Access to the storage facility is shared with the supermarket and sits opposite the junction to Graham Road which leads to a residential estate. There is a pedestrian crossing nearby.
9. The totem sign would be positioned within a landscaped area at the front of the site. It would be a tall and solid structure that would interrupt lines of sight for drivers of vehicles when leaving the shared access and turning onto the main road. Although vehicles close to the site could be travelling at slower speeds due to the position of the pedestrian crossing, the above situation would increase the likelihood of vehicle to vehicle conflict by constraining the ability of drivers of vehicles to be able to see sufficiently clearly and thus observe whether it would be safe to enter Doncaster Road when leaving the site. Given the size and prominence of the sign, it would also be a distraction to drivers of approaching vehicles since their attention may be drawn to the sign rather than the pedestrian crossing as they approach it. This would increase the likelihood of conflict between a vehicle and a pedestrian should people be using the crossing at the time.
10. The proposal would therefore cause harm to public safety and would not comply with the requirements of Policy 13 of the LP as far as they are material to the main issue in it being concerned with development not resulting in an unacceptable impact on highway safety amongst other things.

Other Matters

11. The Eurocell building is not visible from the appeal site and is set within an entirely commercial context. Nevertheless, such an array of signage on the building is an exception not the norm and does not change my findings above.

12. Signage on the supermarket is minimal when compared to the appeal scheme and even less in terms of illumination. Furthermore, the freestanding sign to the front of the supermarket is positioned further back, has a much more lightweight appearance and is of a lesser height than that which is proposed here. The circumstances of each case are different. In addition, the appeal process is impartial, and any pre-application advice taken from the Council or any other interested party would not influence my recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. There would be harm to amenity and public safety. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed since it would accordingly fail an assessment against the above mentioned regulations.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR