



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 May 2025

by **Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2025.

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4423/W/24/3357846

Pavement o/s 108 Pinstone Street, Sheffield S1 2HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nathan Still of Infocus Public Networks Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02651/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4423/Z/24/3357848

Pavement o/s 108 Pinstone Street, Sheffield S1 2HL

- 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 Nathan Still of Infocus Public Networks Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 24/02652/HOARD.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the descriptions of development from the application forms as no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for Appeal A is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting and significance of the City Centre Conservation Area (CA).
4. The main issue for Appeal B is the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

Both Appeals

5. The significance of the CA, which the appeal site is close to, lies in part in its range of historic buildings and public spaces. The topography of the CA means that views into and out of the CA varies. However, the appeal site forms part of a lengthy view both to and from The Moor and along Pinstone Street towards Peace

Gardens and the Town Hall within the CA. This view is currently largely open given the presence of mainly low-level street furniture on this side of the road and the wide pavement by the appeal site. This allows views, and appreciation of the historic buildings and spaces within the CA. Therefore, this setting contributes positively to the significance of the CA.

6. In contrast to the other side of the street where there are several larger features, the proposal would be incongruously taller and/or considerably bulkier than the existing street furniture close to the road on this side of the street. While there is modern and large development close to the site, the position of the proposal close to the road and set away from buildings, at the scale proposed would be discordant. Controls over the type and timing of illumination and the colour of the proposal would not prevent it from being prominent in views to and from the CA. It would obstruct and disrupt views of the CA and erode the openness of this part of the streetscene.
7. The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the CA in regard to Appeal A. There would be benefits from the scheme in relation to improved accessible communication facilities for the public in a busy area using renewable energy. There would also be health and wellbeing benefits associated with the defibrillator and those associated with monitoring the area including air quality and financially for public services. Nevertheless, given the scale of the scheme, these benefits would be small and do not outweigh the harm and great weight that should be given to the conservation of the CA.
8. Therefore, regarding Appeal A, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the setting and significance of the CA. For Appeal B, the proposal would harm the visual amenity of the area. The proposal conflicts with design and heritage protection aims of Policies CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy, S10, BE10, BE13, BE15 and BE16 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework which are material.

Other Matters

9. As above the benefits of the scheme would each be small. Such matters cannot be considered for Appeal B as advertisement appeals relate to amenity and public safety only. The width of the pavement, presence of bollards and set back from the edge of the road mean that there would be sufficient space for pedestrians to pass and there would not be any adverse effects on the movement or safety of other road users.
10. While there are other such facilities in the nearby area, they are materially different to this scheme with regard to location, positions relative to the road and with a context of different street furniture.

Conclusion

11. Therefore, both appeals are dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR