



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/20/3246935

Unit A1 Meadowhall Retail Park, Attercliffe Common, Sheffield S9 2YZ

- 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 Smyths Toys Ltd against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02014/ADV, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 3 x internally illuminated fascia signs; and 1 x internally illuminated above door sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council issued a split decision in which express consent was granted for three of the advertisements that were applied for and refused for an internally illuminated fascia sign located on the side (west facing) elevation (referred to as Part B). My decision relates only to the fascia sign proposed on the west facing elevation.
4. I note that the application form referred to the appeal site as 'Unit 1A' whereas the decision notice and appeal form referred to it as 'Unit A2'. The Council has highlighted that the correct unit number is in fact 'Unit A1'. Accordingly, I have amended the address in the banner heading above to reflect the correct unit number.
5. At the time of my site visit, the approved signs and a sign on the side elevation had been erected. The position of the fascia sign on the side elevation differs from that shown on the plans that are before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I will determine the appeal on the basis of the plans that are before me.

Main Issue

6. The effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that the local characteristics of an area should be considered when assessing amenity. The PPG states that a large poster-hoarding might be permitted in an industrial or commercial area of a major city, where there are large buildings and main highways, and where the advertisement would not adversely affect visual amenity¹. However, the proposal would differ from this type of advertisement in terms of it being internally illuminated and attached to a retail building.
8. Attercliffe Common serves as a main highway connecting the M1 with Sheffield City Centre. The appeal site is located within a retail park where buildings are large in scale. The appeal site is higher than Attercliffe Common and although the side elevation is prominent in this respect it is partially screened by mature landscaping. I note that the retail unit is not located within a Conservation Area and that it has been subject to several appeal decisions and planning applications.
9. I note that the advertisement would be located on the side elevation of the adjoining unit, but this is not critical to my decision. The building is physically separate from the other units located to the east but this does not justify the proposed sign on the side elevation.
10. The side elevation of the building is divided into a series of bays. The signage would be located within one of the larger bays. From the evidence before me, individual lettering signs relating to 'Babies R Us' and 'Toys R Us' were previously located on the side elevation. The proposed advertisement would, however, be more prominent than the previous signs, because of its rectangular box design including an extensive blue background.
11. Furthermore, the drawings before me show that the sign would not be positioned centrally and would be located to one side of the bay which would result in an unbalanced appearance with respect to the architectural features of the building. The existing landscaping would only partially screen the sign and it would be visible from the highway. Whilst the illuminance levels could be conditioned this does not overcome my concern.
12. I note that the appellant has highlighted that effective advertisement is important as the retailer is new to Sheffield, however this is not a consideration which outweighs the harm identified above.
13. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed advertisement would harm the visual amenity of the area. The provisions of the development plan, so far as they are relevant, have been considered. Since the proposed advertisements would cause visual harm to the street scene, the scheme would not meet with the aims of Policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) or paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

¹ Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR