



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 JUNE 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/24/3355596

Outram Fields Care Home, Land between 216B And 288 Twentywell Lane, Sheffield S17 4QF

- 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 Bradway Care Home Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02775/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1no. non-illuminated free-standing entrance sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for installation of 1no. non-illuminated free-standing entrance sign as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations¹.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the determination of the application the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.
4. The Council has referred to the policies that it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken these into account as a material consideration. 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. Therefore, in my determination of this appeal, the Council's policies have not, by themselves, been decisive.
5. The Council have not identified any concerns in respect of public safety. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to form a different view. Having regard to the Regulations, the main issue therefore relates to amenity.

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

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The proposed free-standing sign would be positioned at the entrance of the site. It would measure 2.5 metres high, 1.1 metres wide and be 0.1 metres deep in teal and white.
8. It is acknowledged that advertisements should have a degree of prominence to serve their purpose. The proposal would be visible to road users and pedestrians on Twentywell Lane. However, the proposed advertisement graphics would not be particularly large or garish in composition and form. Moreover, no illumination forms part of the proposal. Accordingly, due to the scale, proposed use of relatively subdued colours and the siting against the existing landscape planting and hedging, a stark contrast would not occur between the advertisement and its muted suburban setting.
9. Whilst the advertisement would be in addition to the existing signage on the opposite corner to the site, given the overall size and scale, when combined with the separation, it would not create an unreasonable sense of clutter. The resulting duplication would create a degree of symmetry across the entrance which would not be harmful to amenity.
10. The Council and interested parties have raised concerns that the proposal could set a precedent for future signage and that the cumulative effect would give rise to an unacceptable impact in terms of visual amenity and create an over commercialised character to the area. However, no directly similar or comparable sites to which this might apply have been put forward. Each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits, and a generalised concern of this nature does not justify withholding consent in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would be acceptable, I can see no reason why it would lead to harmful advertisements on other sites in the area.
11. As such, the proposal would comply with paragraphs 135 and 141 of the Framework. These require proposals to be sympathetic to the character of the local area and to consider the effect of advertisements on amenity. In accordance with the Regulations, I have also considered the development plan so far as it is material. Therefore, the development would be in accordance with Policies BE13 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) which amongst other things seeks to maintain and enhance the city with high quality development. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, the proposal does not conflict with these policies.

Other Matters

12. The issue of need for the advertisement has been raised. This is not, however, a relevant factor in the consideration of an application for advertisement consent.
13. I acknowledge the planning history of the site as set out and that a previous sign was required to be removed from this location. Neither matter however alters my findings in relation to amenity.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR