



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/25/3375760

61-63 High Street, City Centre, Sheffield S1 2GD

- 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 Kings Tower against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02121/HOARD.
 - The advertisement proposed is erection of temporary externally illuminated building wrap advertisement to the southern, southwestern and part of the western elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Kings Tower against Sheffield City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Prior to the submission of the appeal the Sheffield City Centre Conservation Area boundary was extended and now incorporates the area around the appeal site. The site also lies within the setting of several listed buildings. The Regulations¹ advise that factors relevant to 'amenity' include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest, which would encompass nearby listed buildings and Conservation Areas (CAs). Therefore, the location of the site in relation to various heritage assets is relevant to the consideration of 'amenity'.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located at the junction of High Street and Angel Street. This part of the street is located adjacent to the Castle Square tram station and is a busy street predominantly characterised by retail shops and other commercial premises at ground floor.
6. Within this part of the CA there are several listed buildings including the grade II listed 1 and 3 Market Place, the Statue of King Edward VII, The White Building, the Yorkshire Bank and Railings and The Former Sheffield Telegraph and Star

¹ Regulation 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

Building. Moreover, I saw that the grade I listed Cathedral Church of St Peter and St Paul is a short distance to the west. In so far as they relate to this appeal, their significance is derived from their respective historical and architectural interests including their use, age, form, and fabric with each also contributing to the character and appearance of this part of the CA.

7. The appeal building has consent to be demolished and replaced and the proposed advertisement is intended to conceal works once they commence for a twelve-month temporary period. This would take the form of a three-month commercial advertisement with most of the time being an advertisement of the development scheme.
8. The proposed advertisement on the banner wrap would be a significant size spanning multiple floors and windows. Being 13.6m high and 37.5m wide, it would be an unduly large advertisement, which would have a dominating presence in the street scene. Due to the angle of the property, it would be a dominant feature in Castle Square and in views from the west as far as Fargate. The advertisement would be seen in combination with several listed buildings, drawing attention away from them and thus the contribution they make to the street scene and this part of the CA.
9. On my site visit I saw many advertisements in the area around the appeal site. However, these are mostly small in scale and/or at a low level, associated with ground floor retail or commercial premises. I also observed a digital screen advertisement adjacent to the appeal premises. However, I did not see any other advertisements of a similar scale to that proposed on the upper floors of buildings, in such a prominent position in the CA.
10. Overall, the proposal would be a distracting and detracting feature in this part of the CA. Due to its overall size and position it would be visually discordant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area, even having regard to the presence of existing signage. Moreover, my concerns are not the specific content on the advertisement but the size and location of the advertisement.
11. I recognise that the existing building will be subject to construction works and in this regard the advertisement could screen potentially unsightly features. That said, construction activities would not be unusual in a city centre location and would not draw attention to the same degree as the proposed advertisement would.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement, even for a temporary period, would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area. The Council has cited Policies BE13, BE16 and BE19 of its Unitary Development Plan in its reason for refusal. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Consequently, although I have taken them into account, they have not been decisive in my determination.
13. The Council has granted consent for the same scheme in the past. I recognise that consistency in the planning system is important for appellants, local planning authorities, and the public as inconsistency can undermine confidence in the system. Courts have established that like cases should be decided in a like manner. However, that does not mean that like cases must be decided alike and the previous decision does not have to be accepted as 'correct'.

14. Having been granted for a temporary period the Council had the benefit of seeing the implications of its decision when the advertisement was installed and considered it to cause harm. It will be seen that I have also found harm. In this regard, whilst I have had regard to the previous consent, the harm to the amenity of the area is the decisive factor in my considerations.
15. Moreover, as the power to control advertisements under the regulations is exercised in the interests of public safety and amenity, any social or economic benefits emanating from the proposal does not outweigh my findings on this main issue.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR