



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/17/3174891
445 Brightside Lane, Sheffield, S9 2RS

- 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 Mr Peter Huxley (Sytner Group Plc) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00127/ADV, dated 11 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is an LED screen to replace approved P7 Pylon.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the advert upon the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

3. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies they consider to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.
4. The site is a grassed bank alongside a new car dealership building on an arterial route in and out of Sheffield which is identified in the Sheffield Core Strategy as a Gateway Route.
5. The advert would be a free standing double sided LED screen which would be some 2.9m x 2.6m in area and would be mounted on a steel frame to reach a maximum height of some 8m above the ground. Numerous other signs have been permitted around the site, including on the road frontage. The appeal sign would replace a permitted pylon sign.
6. The LED screen would be much brighter and strident than the pylon sign. It would be a garish and brash addition to the roadside. In my view it would be a dominant and visually intrusive feature that would harm the visual amenity of the area.
7. I understand that the appellant is willing to forgo a previously approved LED sign, should the appeal be allowed, but I consider that the proposed free-

standing sign would have a greater visual impact than the building mounted display.

8. I conclude that the sign would harm the character and appearance of the area and I dismiss the appeal.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR