
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/W/16/3162584

32 (Former Baileys), Fife Road, Kingston Upon Thames, Surrey KT1 1SU

- 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 Mr Kevin Brereton against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12567/ADV, dated 25 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2016.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of new shop front with fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the new shop front with fascia sign as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is retrospective and the new shopfront has been installed. The new fascia sign runs above and across the modern shop front forming a cohesive part of its overall structure. It forms an integral part of a new shop front which is of an unfussy modern design which differentiates itself clearly and successfully from the traditional fascia above.
 4. This original fascia above the new shop front remains blank but importantly is retained. It matches the similarly blank original fascia to the shop front on the other side of the intervening entrance to Parman House. I find no harm to visual amenity arising from this proposal and do not consider that it appears unduly incongruous or out of character within this parade of shops.
 5. Account has been taken of Policy DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy of April 2012. This seeks to avoid locating advertisements and signs where these would result in an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the local area. Consideration has also be given to Policy K9 of the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan of 2008 which addresses design quality in the town centre and seeks to provide active and attractive frontages.
 6. Furthermore, the proposal has been assessed against the advice of the Council's Shopfront and Shop Sign Design Guide Supplementary Planning
-

Document of 2005. Whilst all are material to the consideration in this case, given that I have concluded that the proposal results in no harm to visual amenity there is no conflict with the Council's policies or its guidance.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR