
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by Kenneth Stone BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/Y/16/3165689

20 King Street, Saffron Walden, Essex CB10 1ES

- 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 Card Factory against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/16/2509/LB, dated 1 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2016.
 - The works proposed are replacement fascia and projecting sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the replacement fascia sign. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to replacement projecting sign and Listed Building Consent is granted for replacement projecting sign at 20 King Street, Saffron Walden, Essex CB10 1ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/16/2509/LB, dated 1 September 2016, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the works hereby consented and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II listed building known as 20 King Street or any features of special architectural interest that it possesses.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a ground floor shop unit, one of a pair of Grade II listed buildings identified in the list description as C18 but possibly earlier. Both parties note the RCHM suggest it could be as early as 1633. The shop unit and shopfront have been refitted and the shopfront is C20 timber framed, painted white, full glass. The upper floors of the building are in red brick with canted bay windows. The listed building derives its significance from its age and architectural quality including the detail to the front façade and the intimate setting in the centre of the historic town and the close set narrow street and relationship with adjoining properties.
 4. The proposed signage includes a replacement fascia sign with the main fascia being painted in blue and lettering applied and painted in yellow. A small traditional hanging sign is also proposed, attached to the building with a
-

traditional fitting. The Council have raised no objection to the projecting sign and given its location, dimensions, size of lettering and method of fitting I see no reason to differ from this conclusion. On this basis I will allow the appeal in respect of the projecting sign and grant listed building consent for it.

5. The appeal property is located in a commercial street and has a modern shop front. The proportions of the fascia are in keeping with the shop front and building as a whole and not dissimilar to those surrounding. A sign at this location is not objected to in principle. The proposed sign however would see the whole of the fascia painted blue and relatively large and blocky letters applied to it. The letters in comparison to the fascia size, and those of surrounding signs, appear to be large and crude. The simple block form and size appear to pay little regard to the finer detail on the elevation and of adjoining signs. To my mind the lettering appears bulky and unrefined.
6. The sign design maintains the corporate identity of the occupier with little regard paid to the historic environment within which it is set. There are a number of more customised signs of national retail chains in the area which have provided more restrained designs from their normal approach and this adds and retains the restrained and historic setting within which this listed building is experienced.
7. I have a statutory duty to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting and for the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would result in material harm to the Grade II listed building known as 20 King Street and features of special architectural interest that it possesses.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR