



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/24/3350985

152 Shoreham Street, Sheffield S1 4SQ

- 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 Build Hollywood Ltd (Ms Anna McAree) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 24/01767/HOARD, dated 14 June 2024, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2024.
 - The advertisement proposed is retention of non-illuminated timber poster board.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the retention of non-illuminated timber poster board at 152 Shoreham Street, Sheffield S1 4SQ. The consent is for five years and subject to the five standard conditions as set out in the Regulations.

Procedural Matters

2. Under the above Regulations, powers to control advertisements are to be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material and any other relevant factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) reiterate this approach, with the Framework adding that cumulative impacts can be taken into account.
3. The Council has referred to development plan policies in its reasons for refusal. As stated above, advertisement proposals can only be considered on the basis of amenity and public safety considerations. I have therefore taken the development plan policy into account only as far as it relates to these issues.
4. The Council have not raised public safety as an issue and I have no reason to question that, so therefore it will not be taken into consideration in my deliberations.

Main Issue

5. Based on the above, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed advertisement display upon the amenity of the site and its surroundings and its Conservation Area location.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a wall on the end of an existing business, which has historically been a blank elevation, subject to some graffiti. The poster board is attached to the wall, is already installed and has been for some time. It is

- 1.7m high and 10.2m wide, running parallel to Shoreham Street. It is located within the Cultural Industries Quarter Conservation Area (the CIQCA).
7. The CIQCA sits between the City Centre and Sheffield Station. It was designated in 2001 and includes the surviving element of the 18th Century streets that grew as part of the Duke of Norfolk's estate, the remnants of the metal trade areas and examples of the "Little Mesters" (metal trade craftsmen) workshops. It is a mix of commercial and residential properties in the modern era. Due to this modern setting, and the commercial locality that the appeal site is set in, in so far as it relates to this appeal, the appeal site has a neutral contribution to the significance of the CIQCA.
 8. The poster board is located parallel to Shoreham Street and is seen within the Conservation Area but is also seen within its commercial context of buildings and other signage. The appeal sign has static poster advertising only and is read in the context of the wider bustling city centre street scene, on a busy trafficked highway approaching the railway station.
 9. Unsurprisingly, whilst I saw no digital displays close by of the type proposed, there are other advertisements of various designs, forms and heights along the highway. Being within a predominantly commercial area of a major conurbation where there are large buildings and a busy highway gives this locality a character which the PPG identifies as likely to be a suitable location for a poster-hoarding, especially as I consider that the display can be accommodated without adversely affecting the amenities of the neighbourhood of the site. The reference in the PPG to a "major city" should not be taken literally since the advice is laid out for illustrative purposes and no definition is given by what is meant by "major city".
 10. Therefore, I do not find conflict with the advertisement guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. The Council have drawn my attention to policies in both the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009). The advertisement would not conflict with these policies in so far as they are relevant to the appeal.
12. 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, of themselves been decisive, but are material considerations.
13. I observed that when travelling towards the site, the appeal site is seen within the context of nearby commercial and residential development and associated signage. Therefore, the signage the subject to this appeal will not appear as a surprise to highway users and given the visibility and speed of vehicles I observed, would not result in a distraction which would cause a risk to public safety.
14. The specific circumstances of the appeal make the proposal acceptable, any proposed illumination, or change to the nature of the proposal, may well elicit a different response given the site circumstances. This decision does not open

the floodgates for alternative proposals in this location or the wider Conservation Area.

Conditions

15. The Council have asked that the five standard conditions from the Regulations be added if the appeal were to succeed. I have no issue with that request, and as the advertisement is already in-situ, I have no reason to require any additional conditions.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR