
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/25/3374218

Advertising Adjacent to Park House, Bernard Road, Sheffield, S2 5BQ

- 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 Mr Andrzej Gordon-Hides against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02154/HOARD.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of 2x freestanding LED advertising panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the decision notice. The proposal is for two advertisements which would be sited separately from one another. The description provided on the application form refers to a “freestanding portrait advertising panel.”
3. The proposal is for two single-sided digital portrait advertisement screens. Each advertisement screen would measure 7.5m x 5m. The screens would be mounted on green walling. The application form states that the distance from the ground to the base of the advertisement would measure 2.73m. The advertisement screens would be located at either end of a car park fronting Sheffield Parkway. One screen would face east-bound traffic, and the other screen would face west-bound traffic. The advertisements would incorporate an “integrated vertical meadow,” providing greenery below and to the rear of the screens.
4. As part of the proposal, an existing 48 sheet double-sided pole-mounted digital advertisement, located within the car park, would be removed. The existing advertisement screens measure 2.88m by 5.6m and the pole mounted structure reaches a height of around 5.5m.
5. A previous application for a double-sided digital portrait advertisement, to be sited close to Sheffield Parkway around half-way along the car park, was refused¹ and dismissed at appeal².

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

¹ Reference: 23/03004/ADV.

² Reference: APP/J4423/Z/23/3335958.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a car park adjacent to Park House, a two storey brick-built industrial building with steel clad additions. The car park is situated alongside Sheffield Parkway, which is a major dual carriageway to the east of Sheffield city centre.
8. The surrounding area is in commercial and industrial use. Seen from Sheffield Parkway, it is characterised by the presence of commercial buildings set within spacious plots. During my site visit, I noted that this and the presence of mature trees and planting provides for sense of space and greenery.
9. The existing advertisement, located close to Sheffield Parkway towards the centre of the car park, whilst large and prominent, appears within the scale of its surroundings and does not unduly dominate the sky-line.
10. The proposal would see the removal of this existing advertisement and the introduction of two advertisement screens at either end of the car park.
11. The screens would be extremely large. Whilst each screen would be slightly less wide than the existing advertisement screens, their portrait orientation would result in screens between two and three times taller than the existing large and prominent advertisement. Further, the screens would be set on a tall base comprising green walling, such that the structures themselves would reach well over 10 metres in height.
12. I find that this would result in the proposal appearing as two “giant” screens. The screens would appear so tall and prominent that they would dominate the sky-line and appear out of scale with their surroundings.
13. The visual impact of this would not be lessened to any significant degree by the proposed greenery underneath and to the rear of each screen. This proposed greenery would not lessen the visual impact of each advertisement screen, but rather, it would soften the appearance of the rear of the screens and the areas below them.
14. The screens themselves would still draw attention themselves as extremely large and prominent advertisements out of scale with their surroundings. Consequently, the proposed greenery to their rear and below them would not result in them “blending in” with their surroundings.
15. In addition to the above, I find that, in the absence of any other such unduly dominant advertisement in the locality, the proposed screens would appear as incongruous features.
16. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposal would be detrimental to visual amenity, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to saved Policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR