

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/20/3255729
45-49 Catherine Street, Salisbury SP1 2DH

- 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 Mr Nicholas Pratt (NEP Estate Ltd) against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02631/LBC, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The works proposed are described as 'new signage board above the shop frontage'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/W/20/3255725
45-49 Catherine Street, Salisbury SP1 2DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nicholas Pratt (NEP Estate Ltd) against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01995/FUL, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'new signage board above the shop frontage'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal relates to a listed building located within a conservation area, and I shall have special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
 4. Both appeals relate to the same site, and I shall therefore consider the Council's decisions to refuse planning permission and listed building in a single document, given their similarities, and in the interests of brevity.
 5. The description of the proposed development and works as stated on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the descriptions as detailed within the appeal forms, which set out accurately the extent of the proposed development and works. Although the descriptions refer to signage, the appeal scheme does not include any advertising hoarding, which would require separate advertisement consent. I have proceeded on this basis.
-

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposed development and works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building known as 45-49 Catherine Street, and the character or appearance of the Salisbury City Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a Grade II listed building dating from the 16th century which, as noted within the listing description, had to be entirely rebuilt above ground floor level after being largely demolished during the 1980s. The significance of this designated heritage asset derives primarily from its medieval origins, with particular regard to the retention of its timber frame characterised by projecting beam ends and heavy brackets which would have once supported a first floor overhang.
8. The appearance of the shopfront clearly shows that the appeal premises would have historically comprised two separate units. Whilst the shops were subsequently amalgamated, the medieval plot sizes of these commercial units remain nevertheless legible. For these reasons, the appeal building constitutes an important part of the medieval planned history of the settlement and thus makes a significant contribution to the special interest of the Salisbury City Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset.
9. The appeal premises which, at the time of my site visit remained vacant, display a fascia presently sited above the display window of no 45 Catherine Street. The appellant is seeking planning permission and listed building consent for the installation of an additional signage board above nos 47-49. As shown on the proposed plans, this would take the form of an acrylic panel with painted hardwood moulded surround, which would be mounted on the tiled façade of the appeal building, above the entrance and display windows of the shopfront's timber framed element.
10. By extending in an uninterrupted fashion across the two historic shop units, the proposed fascia would have an adverse effect on the ability to understand and appreciate the significance of the listed building. Furthermore, it would, by reason of its excessive size and position, appear as a disproportionate addition which would dominate the façade of the host building and unduly stand out within the street scene. As a result, the proposal would detract from the traditional and restrained approach to shopfront design prevailing in the Conservation Area, which includes many listed buildings.
11. The appellant has referred to other fascia signs situated above commercial premises fronting Catherine Road. However, no substantive evidence is before me as to whether these benefit from listed building or advertising consent and in the absence of such relevant planning history, I attach limited weight to these examples. Whilst this is a commercial part of the town centre, it is nevertheless of historic importance, reflected in its designation as a conservation area, and a sensitive approach to signage is therefore required, all the more so when, as is the case here, it also affects listed buildings.
12. As it would be fixed to more recent fabric, the proposed fascia would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the Grade II listed building and the Salisbury City Conservation Area. In such circumstances, paragraph 196 of

the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the identified harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Although, as noted above, the premises are currently vacant, I have not been presented with substantive evidence demonstrating that the signage board, in its proposed form, is essential to bring the site back into viable use. No other public benefits have been brought to my attention, which would outweigh the identified harm.

13. For the foregoing reasons, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the Salisbury City Conservation Area, and would therefore fail to meet the requirements of the Act. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, which notably requires development proposals to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment, as well as the Council's guide to shopfronts and advertisement design.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR