



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/25/3372101
100 Savile Street, Sheffield S4 7UD

- 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 for the display of an advertisement.
 - The appeal is made by The Storage Team against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01341/ADV.
 - The advertisement is non-illuminated free standing mini-totem advertisement sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council granted express consent for a number of advertisements at the appeal site, however, imposed a condition refusing consent for a non-illuminated free standing mini-totem advertisement sign to the front of the site, which is the subject of this appeal.
3. At the time of my site visit the advertisement was in place, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a self-storage facility located on a busy highway, Saville Street. The Council have approved a number of highly visible advertisements to the site to identify its use. A Starbucks coffee shop with Drive Thru shares access from the adjacent highway. A large Tesco Extra Store and petrol station is located opposite the appeal site; the area is predominantly commercial in nature.
6. The free-standing mini-totem measures 1.2m wide, 2.8m high, and 0.2m in depth, comprises a steel framework with base plates, clad in 3mm black-coated aluminium panels. Shaped folded aluminium logo panels are fixed to the structure, carrying digitally printed graphics and matt white vinyl text is applied to both sides.
7. The non-illuminated free standing mini-totem advertisement is located adjacent to the vehicular entrance to the site, on a small landscape strip separating the appeal site and the adjacent Starbucks building from Saville Street. A small timber knee rail bounds the landscape strip, which also contains two Starbucks free-standing

signs, one smaller, one taller than the appeal totem. Bollard lights are also located within the landscape strip. The public footpath adjacent to the landscape strip contains streetlighting, a large road directional sign, and a utilities cabinet.

8. In assessing amenity, I have taking into account the advertisements on nearby commercial sites. The proposed advertisement would be viewed in the context of a large amount of building signage at the appeal site, other free-standing signage, and street furniture. The appeal totem obscures, to a degree, the view of a smaller Drive Thru Starbucks totem advertisement when travelling from the east along Saville Street.
9. Whilst the totem denotes the entrance to the appeal site, the large signage on the appeal building clearly promotes the identity of the site. The inclusion of another free-standing advertisement on the small, landscaped area creates a proliferation of advertisements; this, combined with the existing street furniture, adds to street clutter. I conclude that the non-illuminated free standing mini-totem advertisement sign is detrimental to the amenity of the area.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to appeals in which Inspectors find totems acceptable. Whilst the appeal references and quotes from the decisions have been offered, the details and context of the allowed signage have not been provided to allow a comparison to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this, each development should be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the merits of the appeal proposal.
11. I conclude that the display of the advertisement proposed would be detrimental to the amenity of the area.
12. I have taken into account Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), and Policies BE5 and BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), which seeks to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with this policy.
13. I find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), which seeks to protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is dismissed, and express consent is refused for the non-illuminated free standing mini-totem advertisement sign.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR