
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by Jane Miles BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 February 2017

Appeal A: APP/Y3940/H/16/3160037

Lloyds Pharmacy, 4 Minster Street, Salisbury SP1 1TF

- 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 Lloyds Pharmacy against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application ref: 16/03464/ADV, dated 11 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The advertisements proposed are described as: 3 x externally illuminated folded aluminium fascias; 2 x internally illuminated folded aluminium projecting signs; 5 x non illuminated internally applied vinyl graphics.
-

Appeal B: APP/Y3940/Y/16/3160040

Lloyds Pharmacy, 4 Minster Street, Salisbury SP1 1TF

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Lloyds Pharmacy against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application ref: 16/03702/LBC, dated 18 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The works proposed are described as: 3 x externally illuminated folded aluminium fascias; 2 x internally illuminated folded aluminium projecting signs; 5 x non illuminated internally applied vinyl graphics.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A & B are both dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address on the application forms (4 Minster Street) relates to the rear of the appellant company's premises which, in this street, appears in the terraced block as a single building unit with a shopfront at ground floor level. However the premises also extend through to the opposite side of the block, where the frontage onto Market Place comprises two distinctly separate frontages, each with a shopfront. These Grade II* listed buildings are described in the list entry as 'Market Place (Oatmeal Row) nos. 16 & 17'. The subsequent description, which also includes a reference to the Minster Street side, undoubtedly relates to the overall property as it is also described in the appeal documentation and illustrated in the submitted drawings. I have determined the appeals on the basis they relate to these buildings, even though the site edged red on the appellant's site location plan appears to encompass only no. 4 Minster Street and no. 17 Market Place.
-

3. I saw at my visit that signage has already been installed. On the Minster Street side there is an externally illuminated fascia sign, together with three internally applied vinyl graphics panels (one filling each of the shopfront's three main windows. There are similar externally illuminated fascia signs above each of the shopfronts on the Market Place side. However, instead of vinyl graphics panels applied directly onto the windows (as originally proposed) there are free-standing display panels inside the shop window.
4. Most of the signage as installed accords with the revised scheme submitted to the Council during the application process, as illustrated on the set of revised drawings with the reference 117506/E. As well as deleting the vinyl panels on the Market Place side, the size of the lettering on all the fascia signs has been reduced and the proposal for two projecting signs has been deleted. However, although the revised drawings indicate the fascia sign on the Minster Street side would be 'non illuminated', an external trough light was in place at the time of my visit.
5. In these circumstances, and for the avoidance of any doubt, I have determined the appeals on the basis that retrospective consents are sought for the three externally illuminated fascia signs and three internally applied vinyl graphics panels, all as installed.

Reasons

6. The Grade II* listed appeal property is in the city centre Conservation Area (CA). The **main issue** in **Appeal A** is the impact of the advertisement signage on visual amenity in the locality, which includes numerous listed buildings of architectural or historic interest and significance, in the CA. The listed buildings and the CA are designated heritage assets. The statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the CA's character or appearance applies insofar as it relates to the consideration of amenity. It is also relevant in **Appeal B** in which the **main issue** is whether or not the signage works preserve the listed buildings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
7. The appeal property is within the row down the western side of Market Place which includes other listed buildings and a variety of treatments and signage at ground floor level. Much of the character and special interest of the individual buildings within this row stems from the age of the buildings and the variety in their designs, features, materials and detailing. Particular features of special interest at the appeal property, which also contribute positively to the CA's character and appearance, include the oversailing upper floors at no. 16 and the elaborate timber-framed two storey bay with curved sides at no. 17. The overall effect of the group at nos. 15-19 is a generally harmonious and subtle mix of forms, features, colours and textures. That also applies to the shopfronts and fascia signs, which differ in height but are mainly in traditional timber with relatively low-key lettering.
8. In this context, the two bright white fascias at the appeal property stand out as intrusive and incongruous features. This is due mainly to a combination of their large size, the size of the lettering and its repetition on both fascias and especially the very smooth and uniform appearance of the more modern materials used. The resultant harmful effect on amenity in the street scene and the CA, in terms of the character, appearance and special interest of the

host buildings and the group comprising nos. 15-19, is all the greater due to the extent to which no. 17's fascia projects out from the building.

9. I appreciate the fascias appear to be the same size as previously¹, and the one at no. 17 retains the curved form which mirrors the distinctive window feature on the floors above. The appellant maintains they are an improvement on the condition in which the sub-fascias had previously been left, but that does not explain why more traditional styles and materials could not have been used. None of these matters is sufficient to outweigh the unsympathetic and intrusive appearance of the new fascias in a historic environment generally characterised by more traditional, textured and subtle materials and signage. I note the examples of other signage on nearby premises highlighted by the appellant, albeit I do not know their planning history. In any event I find none to be as intrusive or inharmonious as the signage at the appeal property.
10. Similar considerations apply to the fascia sign on the Minster Street frontage. Even though this side of the appeal building is not itself as characterful as that in Market Place, it is part of another street scene which includes several notable historic buildings. Moreover on this frontage the harmful impact of the fascia sign is compounded by the vinyl graphics panels which, as already noted, fill the whole of each window panel. In combination these panels create an effect more akin to an advert hoarding than a traditional shopfront, thereby seriously detracting from amenity in terms of the character, appearance and special interest of listed buildings in this historic street in the CA.
11. For the reasons set out above I conclude (in relation to Appeal A) that all of the signage for which consent is sought is harmful to visual amenity in the appeal site locality and to the special interest of the listed buildings. Moreover it would not preserve or enhance the CA's character or appearance. For similar reasons I conclude (in relation to Appeal B) that the signage works detract from the special interest of the listed buildings at nos. 16 and 17.
12. I have taken into account Core Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) which, in seeking to ensure high quality design and conservation of the historic environment respectively, are material in this case. Given the harm the signage causes to amenity, it conflicts with these policies. In Appeal B the harm to heritage assets, in terms of policy guidance in the *National Planning Policy Framework*, is less than substantial. Even so, the *Framework* requires that any harm should be weighed against public benefits. In this case however I cannot find any such benefits sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the heritage assets.
13. Overall therefore, having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude both appeals must fail.

Jane Miles

INSPECTOR

¹ On the basis of photographs included with the appeal submissions