



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/20/3257161

2 Sevenairs Road, Sheffield S20 1NZ

- 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 JD Wetherspoon against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01064/ADV, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 1 set of text and trough light (Section A), 2 sets of text on roof and spot lights (Section C&E), 2 sets of text and spot lights (Section B&F), 2 externally illuminated post mounted signs and 1 set of non illuminated text - Deemed consent under the advert regulations.
-

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 signs 1, 2 (low level roof sign), 3, 4 and 5 and refused sign 2 (high level Wetherspoon roof sign). My decision relates only to the refused high level roof sign.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that, the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed¹. It also states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. Planning Practice Guidance states that, in assessing amenity, regard should be had to the local characteristics of the neighbourhood².

¹ Paragraph 132

² Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306

6. The advertisement would be attached to the roof of a distinctive, large, circular building situated within an open, prominent corner site. Surrounding the site are residential properties, Bighton Community Hospital and Crystal Peaks District Shopping Centre and Retail Park.
7. The sign would detract from the curved roof which is an important architectural feature of the building. The advertisement would draw the eye and would be a visually dominant addition due to its size, siting and design. The openness of the site would exacerbate the prominence of the sign when viewed from the highway. It would break the skyline and would be an incongruous addition to the building.
8. The advertisements associated with the retail park are significantly more discrete than the scheme before me. The scheme would result in an unusual and out of character addition due to the siting of the sign on the roof. The proposed sign, together with those approved, would result in the number of advertisements appearing excessive in comparison to the modest advertisements within the area and compared to the advertisements associated with the existing building.
9. The appellant asserts that the pandemic has made it more difficult to work with the Council and highlights the importance of updating the building in a viable manner. I also acknowledge that the Council has not raised public safety as an issue. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified above. The approved signs would be visible to passers-by and attract customers.
10. 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 advertisement would cause visual harm to the street scene, the scheme would not meet with the aims of Policy BE13 of the Unitary Development Plan, or paragraph 132 of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR