
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Mike Fox BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th December 2016.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/Z/16/3160302

Templeback, 10 Temple Back, Bristol, BS1 6FL

- 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.
 - The appeal is made by St James's Place UK PLC against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04003/A, dated 22 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is a double-sided projecting, non-illuminated banner sign made of stainless steel, to which vinyl letters ('10 TEMPLE BACK') will be applied.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for a double-sided projecting, non-illuminated banner sign made of stainless steel, to which vinyl letters ('10 TEMPLE BACK') will be applied at Templeback, 10 Temple Back, Bristol, BS1 6FL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/04003/A, dated 22 July 2016, subject to the standard conditions in Schedule 2 to the Regulations.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed banner sign on the visual amenity of the street scene, which is located within the Redcliffe Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. 10 Temple Back is an office building within a mixed use area in the Redcliffe Conservation Area. The proposed banner would project at first floor level from the main entrance in the historic façade of the building.
4. The Council considers that the proposed banner sign is unnecessary and would result in visual clutter when combined with existing signage on the building; that its excessive size and height would make it unduly prominent in the street scene; and that the proposed vinyl finish would be of a low quality. It argues that the impact of these factors would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the Conservation Area.
5. From my site visit and from studying the submitted drawings and photo-montages, I consider that the proposed sign would not be excessively high or large in relation to the host building which has a height of 6 storeys and an extensive frontage. Although there are other signs in the street, they are not sufficiently numerous or close together to give the perception of clutter. The

use of vinyl lettering on a stainless steel background would not in my view be inappropriate in its context, which comprises a wide street, lined with buildings with long frontages and which, whilst not unattractive, are also generally unremarkable in their architecture and which in my view make a limited contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

6. The immediate surrounds of the appeal site lack the vibrancy of some parts of Bristol, with a relatively low footfall. Any minor harm to the historic façade would be counterbalanced by an additional focal point in this wide but relatively quiet street, whilst I consider that the proposal would animate the streetscene. On balance, taking into account the above considerations, I conclude that the effect on the visual amenity of the streetscene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be neutral.
7. I have carefully considered *Bristol Core Strategy* policy BCS21 (quality urban design) and *Bristol Site Allocations and development Management policies* policies DM26 (Local character and distinctiveness) and DM31 (heritage assets). I have also studied the Redcliffe Conservation Character Appraisal. All of these policies and documents reflect advice in national guidance and legislation. The neutral effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area means that it would not be contrary to any of these policies or documents or the statutory requirement for development to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas¹.
8. The appeal therefore succeeds. Given the generally non-intrusive and non-illuminated character of the proposal, no conditions are necessary other than those standard conditions which apply to all consents.

Mike Fox

INSPECTOR

¹ The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 72 (1).