

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2023

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/22/3313646

Go Outdoors, Joseph Hayward House, 2 Fox Valley Way, Sheffield, S36 2AB

- 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 Farmery against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02767/ADV, dated 25 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is Size: 5000 x 2400mm – Main GO sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The advertisement the subject of this appeal is already in place.
3. The address above is taken from the application form plus further detail provided on the Council's decision notice and on the appeal form, specifically, "Go Outdoors, Joseph Hayward House."
4. The name of the appellant is taken from the application form. The appeal form also refers to the company name, Go Outdoors Retail Limited.
5. In addition to the application reference number, the Council's decision notice includes reference to a previous application number (PP-11427429).
6. The description of the advertisement is taken from the application form. In its decision notice, the Council described the advertisement as an "illuminated fascia name sign."
7. The advertisement is a 5 metre by 2.4 metre internally illuminated sign at the front of a shop. It is fitted to a metal gantry above the entrance canopy over the doorway into the shop. The sign is positioned 3.9 metres above ground level.
8. Whilst the description on the application form refers to a single 5m by 2.4m sign, the appellant and the Council refer to a smaller second sign, also already in situ. The Council states that the second sign referred to is not illuminated and that it is considered to be acceptable. This appeal decision therefore focuses on the advertisement described above.

Main Issue

9. The main issue in this case is the effect of the advertisement on visual amenity.
-

Reasons

10. The appeal property forms one of a row of retail units located within a large retail park in Stocksbridge. The units are located in a tall red-brick building, designed to include large arched windows and incorporating decorative brickwork and stone archways.
11. The advertisement is located directly above the front entrance of the unit. During my site visit, I observed that whilst the majority of advertisements above unit entrances appear large in scale, the advertisement the subject of this appeal appears considerably larger than these.
12. As a result, the advertisement draws undue attention to itself as an incongruous feature – out of keeping with the scale of other signs to the front of retail units. This detracts from the row's sense of uniformity.
13. Further to the above, the size of the advertisement is such that it greatly obscures much of the significant arched window above the store entrance and appears overly-large and awkward on its metal gantry.
14. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the advertisement appears detrimental to visual amenity, contrary to the Framework and to UDP¹ policy BE13, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

15. In support of the advertisement, the appellant draws attention to previous signage at the site. However, this was for a different form of signage to that the subject of this appeal. I am also mindful that the Council states that this previous signage did not have advertisement consent and there is no evidence before me to the contrary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998).