



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/20/3258774

253 Halifax Road, Wadsley Bridge, Sheffield S6 1AD

- 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 Trinity Media Ltd against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01329/ADV, dated 24 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is digital advertisement board.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of the advertisement from the Council's decision notice as this accurately represents the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal consists of a 'V' shaped structure with 2 LED display screens. It would be located in the forecourt of a building which was vacant at the time of my site visit, but which evidence suggests has previously been in a business use although it has an extant consent for conversion to a dwelling.
5. The site is located adjacent to the busy dual carriageway of Halifax Road. Although there is a defined shopping centre and commercial area on the other side of the road which includes a number of advertisements, the appeal site is set within the visual context of a residential area to the north and open areas to the south. Within this context, the sign would appear as obtrusive clutter which would be clearly separate from the commercial area and would contrast uncomfortably with its residential and landscaped setting.
6. This visual harm would be exacerbated due to the illuminated and changing nature of the images. Whilst the individual images would be static, the regular change over approximately every 10 seconds would draw the eye and increase the visual prominence of the sign. Illumination provided by existing features such as streetlights, street furniture and passing traffic would be of a different

nature to the proposed display and would not mitigate its obtrusive appearance.

7. There were a number of signs associated with a previous business on the site, including a freestanding sign in approximately the same location as the appeal proposal. However, these were associated with the business and therefore reflected the role of the site at that time. Moreover, there is no evidence that the freestanding sign was illuminated. The previous existence of advertisements on this site does not therefore weigh significantly in favour of an advertisement of the form proposed.
8. It is proposed that the sign would not be illuminated between 10pm to 6am and that the level of brightness could be controlled depending on lighting conditions. However, this would not suitably mitigate the harm to amenity arising from the inappropriate and prominent location of the proposal.
9. I conclude that, due to its siting and design, the proposed advertisement would have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of the area. I have taken into account policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 which states that advertisements will be permitted only if they would not harm the character and appearance of the area, as well as other criteria. Due to the harm identified above, the proposal conflicts with policy BE13. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, as appropriate to each case. Therefore, although I have had regard to these policies, they have not been a decisive consideration in my determination of this appeal.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR