



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2026

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Z/25/3376552

3A Abbeydale Road South, Sheffield S7 2QL

- 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 Miss Hannah Ellis on behalf of Dental IT against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02974/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as “This advertisement will be a single billboard on the side of our office building advertising our IT support services. Our brand, Tenacity is a Sheffield-based IT support company offering multiple IT services to businesses across Sheffield and the UK”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance reiterate this approach. I have taken Policy BE13 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (March 1998) (the UDP) into account as a material consideration; however, this has not, by itself, been determinative for this appeal.
3. The Council’s reason for refusal specifically relates to matters of amenity. There was no objection raised on the grounds of public safety, and I find no reason to take a different view on that matter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to an attractive large, detached building which retains many original architectural features. The building has been subdivided into a number of commercial units with shopfronts on the ground floor and a separate access for the first-floor unit via an enclosed stairwell addition on the side elevation. There are a number of existing non-illuminated advertisement boards and a banner visible to the side of the appeal property when approached from the south-west.

6. The property is located at a signalled road junction forming part of a busy arterial route into the city. The surrounding area is mixed in character with those buildings immediately surrounding the junction being in a variety of commercial uses with residential properties beyond. The buildings are generally historic with elevations displaying architectural features characteristic of their period. Together, the grouping of buildings which the appeal site sits within creates a characterful and attractive street scene.
7. The proposed non-illuminated advertisement would measure approximately 2.6m x 1.4m and would be affixed to the side elevation of the building at high-level. The purpose of the proposed advertisement is to advertise the business operating at first floor level.
8. Due to its prominent high-level siting and large size, the proposed advertisement would occupy a large proportion of the side elevation and would therefore dominate the wall above the enclosed stairwell. It would also add to the proliferation of advertisements located to the side of this building, detracting from the attractive character of the building. In coming to this view, I acknowledge that many of the neighbouring buildings contain advertisements at shopfront fascia level and also at high level on side elevations.
9. While there are examples of similar advertisements on side elevations in the vicinity, rather than providing justification for the proposal in question, if anything, their presence points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the amenity of the area is to be safeguarded.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the amenity of the area due to its size, positioning and cumulative impact. In this regard, the advertisement would conflict with the aims of Paragraph 141 of the Framework. Although not determinative, there would also be conflict with the amenity aims of Policy BE13 of the UDP which seeks to support advertisements provided they do not harm the character or appearance of the area and relate in scale and design to their surroundings.

Other Matters

11. I note the appellant's assertion that the advertisement would support a local business that provides local employment and services to the community, generally benefiting the local economy. However, advertisements are controlled only in the interests of amenity and public safety and as such the above points make no difference to my overall conclusion.
12. There is also reference to the conduct and advice of the Council during the evolution of the appeal proposal and application process. However, these are not matters for my deliberation in the context of an appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would harm amenity and the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR