
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

by Steven Hartley BA(Hons) Dist.TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2022

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/22/3292532
66-68, Wicker, Sheffield S3 8JD**

- 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 Mr Richard Page, Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04734/HOARD (formerly PP-10357810), dated 2 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as the upgrade of an advertising site to display digital content at 68 Wicker Road, Sheffield S3 8JD.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the amenity of the area.

Procedural Matters

3. The appeal is described as an upgrade of an advertising site. However, on my site visit I could not see any evidence of the site being used for advertisement purposes. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers that there has been no advertisement in place since 2009. I have no evidence before me to dispute this. Therefore, and considering my observations on my site visit, I have determined the appeal on the basis that this would be a new site for the display of advertisements.
4. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.

The Main Issue

5. The Council raises no objection to the proposal because of public safety. Subject to the imposition of conditions, I have no reason to disagree. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the amenity of the area.

Reasons

6. The proposed advertisement board would be located on a gateway property to the Wicker, on a highway route into the city centre and overlooking a highway junction on the A61, Derek Dooley Way. It would be within a defined central shopping area which is a mix of mainly two and three storey properties. There are more modern high-rise buildings close-by.
7. On my site visit, I observed that most advertising signage in the immediate area is confined to no higher than first floor level and displays are static images relating to the names of the commercial premises beneath them. Signage is low key and relatively discrete in terms of its visual impact. Few are lit.
8. The proposed advertisement board would be some 5.2 metres from the ground, above first floor level and would be fixed to the elevation of number 68, the Wicker. The hoarding would have a height of approximately 3 metres and a width of 6 metres and would be internally lit. It would have static imagery which would automatically change every 10 seconds. It would operate both during the day and at night.
9. I was not able to observe any comparable digital advertisement displays in the immediate area and the proposed hoarding, by its size, height, lighting, location and changing images, would introduce an alien feature which would be materially out of keeping with the more modest form of advertising in the area and which I have described above.
10. In addition, the proposed location of the sign on the white rendered elevation to 68 the Wicker would take up a disproportionate area of the elevation and would dominate its appearance. As such, it would not add positively to the visual attraction of the building.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed advertisement hoarding would not accord with the Council's Unitary Development Plan (1998) policy BE13 which opposes large advertisements which would harm the character and appearance of an area, or with policy BE10 which aims to create attractive streets. It would be contrary to the Council's Core Strategy (2009) policy CS74 which requires high quality development that contributes to the creation of attractive neighbourhoods, and with policy CS74 which relates to the improvement of gateway routes, including environmental improvements. It would not accord with paragraphs 112(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which encourages the creation of attractive places, avoiding unnecessary street clutter and which responds to local character and design standards, or with paragraph 136 which opposes poorly sited signage.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the benefits which a digital display can bring by, amongst other things, eliminating waste by having to print advertisements, and that the display could be used for broadcasting, for example, emergency and public health messages. I have also taken account the proposed level of illumination which would not exceed the maximum levels advised by the Institute of Lighting Professionals. I have considered the fact that the appeal site is not within a Conservation Area and is not adjacent to any listed buildings and that

the site may have been used for advertisement purposes in the past. However, none of the above outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR