The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/20/3250930
1 Rockingham Gate, Sheffield S1 4JD

- 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 Premier Vue against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application Ref 20/00458/ADV, dated 6 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2020.
- The advertisement proposed is installation of a digitally imprinted hi-tech micromesh PVC banner depicting Portland Stone cladding to first and second floor exterior wall facing Rockingham Gate incorporating an 7.6m x 9.8m commercial advertising area.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Council's Decision Notice as it is more concise than the description given on the application form. This description was also utilised by the appellant on the appeal form. I am therefore satisfied that there is no prejudice to the interests of either party by the change.

Main Issue

3. The Regulations make clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council raises no objection on public safety grounds, and I have no reason to take a different view. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the junction of Rockingham Gate and The Moor, which is a significant retail/commercial area of the city centre. The building where the proposal is to be sited is three storeys with ground floor commercial use and office uses above.

5. The appeal proposal would be a PVC banner screen and would be located on the first and second floors of the building on the elevation facing Rockingham Gate. It would measure approximately 28m by 10.5m and would be printed with a Portland Stone effect to mirror the appearance of surrounding buildings, covering the existing brick elevation. Within the banner would be a section utilised for commercial advertisement of approximately 10m by 7.6m. From the

evidence in front of me, the banner is not proposed to have any illumination and would be 0.2m from the actual elevation.

6. Whilst the banner is shown to cover existing windows, the Planning Practise Guidance advises that amenity, in the context of the control of advertisements, includes aural and visual amenity, but does not extend to considerations relating to matters such as outlook. Therefore, given the powers to control advertisements set out in the Regulations, this matter is not determinative in my consideration of the appeal.

7. As well as being large in size, the banner would be in an elevated position at first and second floor level and would be highly visible to pedestrians at ground floor level. Whilst the banner is designed to replicate the Portland Stone finish of surrounding buildings, it would be prominent on the building and be overly dominant in the surrounding area. I have noted the advertisements and signage on surrounding buildings, which are in keeping with the host buildings in terms of size and positioning.

8. I find that whilst the host building has limited architectural merit, the proposed banner would introduce an incongruous and large feature to the building, which is relatively uniform and modest in appearance on that elevation.

9. I consider that the proposal would be a dominant addition to the street scene and would unacceptably harm the visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively state that advertisements would not harm the character and appearance of the area and should relate in scale and design to their surroundings

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to a previous decision for a similar advertisement, however, few details have been provided. In any event, as it is not directly comparable to the appeal development and is of limited weight.

11. I have noted the support for the scheme from other businesses, in terms of improving the locality. However, the harm that I have identified outweighs any benefit to local business from the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR