



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

**by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/Z/19/3223812**

**The Nags Head, 161 High Street, Henley-in-Arden B95 5BA**

- 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 Star Pubs and Bars against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
  - The application Ref 18/02866/ADV, dated 27 September 2018, was partly refused by notice dated 9 January 2019.
  - The advertisement proposed is the erection of illuminated fascia sign to the front elevation and two white 'Portland' Edwardian lanterns.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The application leading to this appeal proposed several advertisements. The Council has issued a split decision, granting advertisement consent for most of the signs, but refusing consent for the advertisement described in the banner above. For the avoidance of doubt, my consideration relates only to the illuminated fascia sign with lanterns to the front elevation.
3. The description in the banner heading is based on a combination of those set out on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice. In explaining the position of the proposed sign and referring to the two white 'Portland' Edwardian lanterns, the description I have used more accurately describes the proposed advertisement.
4. Information provided since the appeal was lodged confirms the applicant name on the application form is incomplete and the appellant should be the company name as set out above.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on amenity.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site lies in the Henley-in-Arden Conservation Area (CA) and I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I have also had regard to the effect of the proposal on the setting of the adjoining grade II listed building, 163 and 165 High Street.

7. The CA is centred on the High Street. Most of the buildings along the road include historic architectural features, reflecting the various periods in which they were built and creating an interesting and varied street scene. The front of the appeal property is striking, with exposed black timber and white panelling at first floor level seen for some distance along the road. As such, the building contributes positively to the appearance and significance of the CA.
8. The proposed sign would conceal part of the timber framing that adds interest to the front elevation. By reason of its positioning, broad width and low height, the sign would represent a stark horizontal feature at odds with the predominant vertical emphasis provided by the timbers. Furthermore, the proposed Edwardian style lanterns would be incongruous with the exposed timber and panelling which is reflective of an earlier age. Through a combination of these factors, the proposed sign would detract from the appearance of the front elevation, would undermine the positive contribution the appeal property makes to the appearance of the CA and therefore would have a harmful effect on the amenity of the street scene.
9. The appeal building is not listed and I find the sign would not cause detriment specifically to the significance of the adjacent listed building. However, these factors fail to obviate the identified harm to the appeal building and wider street scene.
10. I do not know the full circumstances that has led to the display of the existing advertisements brought to my attention and I have dealt with the appeal on its own merits. However, I note the hotel signs are on brickwork and so do not conceal any timber framing. The takeaway sign slightly covers framing at first floor level but not to the same extent as the appeal proposal. The fascia sign at the solicitors is incongruous and therefore is unworthy of replication.
11. I also note the wording on the proposed sign would be easier to read, however the existing lettering is still legible and allows full appreciation of the timber framing. Consequently, the appellant's comments do not address nor override the identified harm that would be caused to the amenity of the area.
12. I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, in accordance with the Regulations<sup>1</sup>. Policy CS.9 of the adopted Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011 to 2031 (SADCS) and Annex B of the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide 2001 seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. I have concluded the proposed advertisement would harm amenity and therefore it would not be in accordance with this policy and guidance. The proposed sign would also be contrary to policy CS.8 of the SADCS in that it would fail to preserve or enhance the appearance or character of the CA.
13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other material factors raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Jonathan Edwards*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements)(England) Regulations 2007.