



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/22/3292809

Martin Lee Car Sales, 2 Livesey Street, Sheffield S6 2DB

- 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 Graeme Hughes (Alight Media) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05258/HOARD, dated 14 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection and display of a double-sided freestanding 48-sheet sized (6m x 3m) digital LED advertising unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council have referenced a policy within the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan. I have taken this into account where relevant, but the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) clearly states that issues to be addressed should only include amenity and public safety, which is reiterated by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG).
3. The Council have opposed the application on the grounds of amenity only and consider that the proposal would not detract from public safety. I have no reason to question that assessment and will not deal with the public safety issue any further in my report.

Main Issue

4. Based on the above, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on a stopped-off corner of Livesey Street and the busy A61 Penistone Road, leading into Sheffield city centre. The larger site is made up of a car sales pitch. The surrounding area is commercial and industrial in nature.
6. The advertisement proposed would be approximately 6m x 3m in size, double sided, supported by 3.2m high legs, with LED illumination, and static imagery that changes instantly.

7. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) gives an example that, in considering the effect on amenity of a proposed advertisement, a large advertisement would be refused where it would dominate a group of listed buildings but would be permitted in an industrial or commercial area of a major city (where there are large buildings and main highways) where the advertisement would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood of the site.
8. Although it is in the latter context which I find the appeal proposal, I find that its size and siting, and being mounted on legs, would lead to it being a dominant and obtrusive feature. Although located within a busy commercial area, because of the siting and its scale I find that the display would be an overbearing visual feature in the environment. While it would not have a direct impact on any building, due to its scale, the display would be unduly imposing in the street scene.
9. It would occupy a prominent position and is sufficiently removed from the nearest buildings. As a result, due to its size, it would appear isolated and incongruous. The display of illuminated digital images would be striking and prominent and would not integrate well into the locality. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would create an alien feature.
10. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Paragraph 136 of the Framework which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR