
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2017

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/Z/17/3181078

19 Pound Street, Carshalton, SM5 3PG

- 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 Daniel Maekins, X-Tru against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref C2017/76864/ADV, dated 7 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2017.
 - The advertisement proposed is three non-illuminated fascia signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on amenity, including the character and appearance of the Carshalton Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest single storey commercial building on the corner of Pound Street and Carshalton Park Road. A shop front is located in the front elevation. Whilst there is a public house and a school in the vicinity of the site, it is predominantly a residential area with few commercial buildings or advertisements.
4. The proposal involves 3 fascia signs that would wrap around the building on both of its street fronting elevations. The signage would be 1.5 metres tall, protruding above the roof of the building in some areas. The combined height and width of the signage would combine to create a substantial fixture to the building. The modern aluminium material and stark monochrome colours would add to their prominence in the street scene.
5. I consider that the signage would become a dominating aspect of the building which would be at odds with its modest scale and proportions. Whilst I acknowledge that advertisements are often eye catching by their nature, the proposed signage would be unnecessarily large, appearing discordant in the context of the building, the largely residential area and the wider conservation area. As such, it would be visually intrusive and unacceptably harm amenity.
6. I have regard to Policies DM1, DM3 and DM4 of the Site Development Policies Development Plan Document (2012) and Sutton's Urban Design Guide 'Creating Locally Distinctive Places' Supplementary Planning Document (2008)

so far as they relate to amenity. As I have found harm in this regard, the proposal is in conflict with these policies.

7. I note the signage attached to the building on the corner of Pound Street and Wallace Crescent. However, this building is not located in the conservation area and the signage does not appear to be of the scale proposed in this case. As such, I do not consider it to be comparable or to lend any support to the appeal proposal.
8. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR