



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 FEBRUARY 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/22/3309959

85A Chesterfield Road, Sheffield S8 0RN

- 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 Group Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02854/HOARD, dated 22 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of a 48-sheet paper paste advertising display to historic advertising site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 stipulate that control may only be exercised in the interests of 'amenity' and 'public safety.' The development plan policy put forward by the Council in its reason for refusal is not determinative, but I have taken this into account as a material consideration.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated on the eastern side of the A61 Chesterfield Road, which is an arterial route from the city centre. The area comprises a mix of commercial and residential uses. The proposed advertisement display would be positioned on the gable wall of an end of terrace property, facing another gable end, between which is a car dealership with residential flats above, with a small forecourt facing the street.
5. The western side of Chesterfield Road comprises larger format retail and commercial premises, with a modest retail park further to the south. The eastern side comprises smaller shops and businesses, with a built form that is more domestic in scale, reflecting the housing areas to the rear of the eastern side of Chesterfield Road.
6. Notwithstanding the appellant's generalised assertion that gable ends are suitable locations for such advertisements, due to its scale, size and siting, the proposed display would occupy a considerable proportion of the width of the

gable end, to a height below the eaves. It would dominate the domestic scale of the host building. It would be a visually obtrusive feature that would appear incongruous within the context of the domestic scale of the streetscene on the eastern side of the street, regardless of the purported District Shopping Centre designation.

7. While I accept that the area includes large scale advertisements including totem signs, these are on the western side of Chesterfield Road, which has a different commercial character, being much more modern and to a larger scale. The existing advertisements on the eastern side of the main road are of a much smaller scale than that proposed. They predominantly comprise fascia signs and small projecting signs. The advertisements above the chamfered corners to adjacent streets on the eastern side of Chesterfield Road are larger than the predominant forms on the eastern side, and much smaller than the scale of the proposal before me.
8. The appellant suggests that the proposed display would screen an unsightly wall. At my visit, the gable end was finished in a grey coloured render, in need of some maintenance. Even if I were to accept that the existing gable end is unsightly, the proposed display would not screen the whole of the gable, nor would it be the only way to achieve that objective.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would unacceptably harm the amenity of the area.

Other Matters

10. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan only insofar as they are relevant. Policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 states (among other things) that large scale poster advertisements will be permitted only if they do not harm the character or appearance of the area or be the only practical means of screening an unsightly building or area of land; and relate in scale and design to their surroundings. For the above reasons, the proposal would therefore not accord with Policy BE13. The advertisement would also conflict with the advice contained within paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed, while paragraph 130 advises that development should ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
11. The appellant refers me to a previously dismissed appeal¹ for an 6m x 3m digital advertising display at this site. While the digital nature of this proposal is not comparable to the proposal before me, the inspector carefully considered the proposal within the context of the domestic scale of the built form within the immediate area, and the relationship of the proposal to the host property, concluding that *"...the display would cover a large section of the gable end and would jar with the simple form of the host building"* which corresponds with my own findings.
12. The appellant draws my attention to other examples relating to similar proposals. The full details of the examples are not before me, and I cannot therefore consider to what degree they may be comparable to the case before me. Those in different areas have their own unique contexts, and as such have

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/21/3282686

limited bearing on my consideration of this appeal. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me and my own observations.

13. The appellant asks me to consider the economic benefits of the proposal. These matters do not relate to public safety or amenity, and thus cannot be taken into account. The consideration of historic and/or unauthorised advertisements and enforcement matters are not within my jurisdiction in determining this appeal. The presence or otherwise of any agreement to implement or service the proposal is not a determinative matter in this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed advertisement would unacceptably harm amenity, and therefore I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR