



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2024

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11TH March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/23/3329670

418 Pitsmoor Road, Sheffield S3 9AY

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Group Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02074/HOARD, dated 26 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2023.
 - The advertisement proposed is removal of existing paper and paste billboard and replacement with digital billboard.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In accordance with the Regulations¹, and the Planning Practice Guidance, I have considered solely matters of amenity and public safety.
3. In December 2023, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been significantly amended. As a result, I have not sought further submissions from the main parties.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to the gable end of 418 Pitsmoor Road, a two storey terraced property which is in use as a hot food takeaway at ground floor. The property forms part of a short parade of shops and is within a Local Shopping Centre. The surrounding area is of mixed character with residential properties and a variety of business premises, including the public house opposite and the adjacent food store which is set back from the appeal property.
6. There are a variety of building sizes and designs in the local area. Whilst there are a number of modern elements in the surrounding area, including blocks of flats, an MOT testing centre and adjacent car park, the prevailing character is that of traditional two storey properties such as the terraced properties and public houses which are arranged along linear building lines with a strong

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended)

street scene presence. These attributes positively contribute to the character of the area. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings nearby. However, the area has been identified by the Council as an Area of Special Character.

7. Whilst the gable end of the appeal property is not visible from the north, it is highly prominent when travelling along Pitsmoor Road from the south. The proposed sign would not obscure any significant architectural features of the building, but it would occupy a substantial part of the gable end and would appear out of scale and proportion on this modest terraced property. Its scale would not be sympathetic in the context of surrounding two storey properties.
8. The area is already well lit by street lighting and there are a variety of other advertisements and lighting to nearby business premises, including shop signage and the large advertisements at the front of the adjacent food store and to the gable end of 424 Pitsmoor Road. However, I did not observe any other comparable illuminated advertisements of this size in the area. Those that are illuminated generally relate to the premises on which they are sited. The proposal would therefore stand out from other advertisements in the area and would be an unduly prominent and discordant feature in the street scene.
9. The appellant states that the appeal site has been an established location for advertising since at least 2008 and that the existing advertisement benefits from deemed consent, but the advertisement had been removed from the gable end by the time of my site visit. The appellant considers that the proposal would constitute a like for like replacement of the previous paper and paste display, but the proposed digital display would be likely to appear brighter and sharper and therefore significantly more conspicuous than the previous display.
10. The proposal would be within the guidelines set by the Institute of Lighting Professionals Technical Note 5 and would be controlled by light sensors to vary the brightness of the screen according to the conditions. The maximum brightness of the proposal would not exceed 300cd/sqm at night. Nevertheless, the position and size of the sign, and the digital display with images changing at frequent intervals, would result in a discordant and intrusive feature in this location. I have considered the appellant's suggested conditions, including controls on the hours of operation of the sign, maximum luminance and frequency of changes between adverts, but these would not sufficiently mitigate the harm I have identified.
11. The appellant has referred to examples of other similar advertisements elsewhere. On the basis of the details that have been provided I cannot be certain that they offer a direct comparison to the appeal proposal or its site-specific context. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits.
12. My attention has been drawn to the various benefits of the proposal, including a reduction in the number of vehicle trips, CO2 emissions and waste; lower energy requirements; the opportunities to advertise charitable campaigns, public art and emergency messages; reduced advertising clutter; and an increase in business rates. However, I am not persuaded that this is the only location in which the advertisement could take place. This limits the weight I afford to the benefits arising from this proposal. I consider that the public benefits would not outweigh the substantive harm I have identified. Although

the proposal would not harm public safety, this is a neutral matter that does not outweigh the harm to the amenity of the area.

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a significantly harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area, including the Area of Special Character. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material, although they have not been decisive. The proposal would conflict with Policies BE13 and BE18 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan. These policies seek to ensure that large, illuminated advertisements do not harm the character and appearance of the area, including Areas of Special Character. The proposal would also conflict with Framework, which states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed and seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

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

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR