
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/17/3176698

Mercedes Benz, Sheffield Road, Tinsley, Sheffield, S9 2FZ

- 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 Mercedes-Benz UK against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01009/ADV, dated 9 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 x wall panel with illuminated star.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original planning application proposed a number of advertisements. The Council issued a decision that granted consent for the scheme, but attached a condition that effectively refused consent for a single large wall panel with an illuminated star facing Sheffield Road. My Decision relates solely to the advertisement that was refused permission by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal sign would be located on the south eastern elevation of the building, facing Sheffield Road, and would be seen alongside the other advertisements that were approved by the Council. The appeal building is within a predominantly commercial area, and opposite to a new Ikea store that is currently under construction.
5. The proposed sign would be significantly larger than the other advertisements along the frontage of the dealership. It would be 6.40 metres tall by 3.75 metres wide, and would be in a prominent position fronting a busy dual carriageway. In this location it would be highly visible to passing motorists and pedestrians, and would appear imposing in size and disproportionately large. In particular, its considerable width would appear bulky and it would be viewed as a large opaque block. In my view, it would have an unsympathetic appearance that would be out of scale with other adverts in the vicinity.

6. The appellant has submitted photographs of a similar sign at a Mercedes Benz dealership in Oxford. However, that sign is significantly set back from the road, and it is therefore not directly comparable to the current proposal.
7. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a number of other nearby advertisements. However, the Council state that the Tile Megastore banner is unauthorised, and the Premier Inn signs are not in accordance with the approved plans. Furthermore, I note that the Next Home and Garden store has individual letter signs that are sited on a much larger building. Any future signs on the Ikea store will also be sited on a much larger building. Accordingly, I do not consider that these advertisements provide a justification for the appeal sign.
8. Whilst the appellant states that they have explored the possibility of a narrower sign with the Council, no drawings or details of this have been submitted with the appeal documentation.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the advertisement is detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR