



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 May 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/23/3316338

280 Ecclesall Road, Sheffield, S11 8PE

- 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 Paul Hardy, V2 LED Ltd against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03070/HOARD, dated 17 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The advertisement proposed is a single wall mounted portrait 16-sheet LED advertising display panel (measuring 2.8m x 1.92m).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property part of a terrace of mixed-use properties, which is situated in a busy local commercial area. Ecclesall Road is a principal route to and from the city centre and signage in the immediate area is prevalent and highly visible. Most of the existing advertisements are positioned on the frontages of properties, at fascia level, or are projecting signs.
4. The proposal is to erect a 16-sheet wall mounted internally illuminated LED sign on the side gable wall of the property. It would not display moving images, but the display would change at regular intervals (10 seconds).
5. I note that the Council does not object to the proposal in terms of public safety. I have no reason to disagree with that conclusion.
6. The Council Officer's report and its decision notice refers to the proposal conflicting with the provisions of the Development Plan and quotes Policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan. The policy seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that advertisements do not harm the character or appearance of an area. Planning policies are not, in themselves, determinative in considering proposals for advertisements. Nevertheless, the impact of the proposal on the visual amenity and character and appearance of the area is a main consideration.
7. Notwithstanding the wide array of advertisements along this part of Ecclesall Road, adverts on the side walls of properties are not common. The existing

blank side wall of the appeal property is highly visible when approaching from the city centre and the proposed display would appear unduly prominent and at odds with the predominant form of advertising in the area, because of its height, size and illumination. In my opinion, the proposal would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the streetscene at this point.

8. I note that the Council refer to the impact of the proposed advertisement on the natural stone wall of the building. However, I do not find against the proposal for that reason, given that stone buildings are common in the area and it is inevitable that signage will be displayed on such properties, should the advertisements themselves be acceptable.
9. I have also considered other advertisements that have been brought to my attention by the appellant. In particular, I viewed the existing signage on the Marks and Spencer building, which is also on its side walls. However, one of the side elevations contains the main entrance to the store, whilst on the other side the design and method of display is different to the appeal proposal. Consequently, I am not persuaded that these create a precedent for the appeal decision.
10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR