



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/W/20/3255300

1152 Melton Road, Syston LE7 2HB

- 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 Mrs Charlotte Mannouris against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/20/0085/2, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The advertisement proposed is a light box sign, attached to the front of shop, displaying the shop name. The sign is a box 3.2m wide x 0.6m high x 0.1m deep.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the sign on the character and appearance of the building it is displayed on as well as the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a shop situated in a row of commercial properties each with fascia signs of varying designs. The appeal property displays attractive period architectural features which are shared by the other properties in the row and are all part of a larger building frontage. The wider street scene comprises of a number of commercial properties with signage which increase in frequency towards the district centre which the appeal property is close to but on the periphery of.
4. The architectural detailing of the host building frontage includes a planned gap for an appropriately sized fascia sign to sit directly above the shop bay window and main front entrance. The fascia sign erected has exceeded the original planned space for a shop sign to be positioned. As a result, it appears at odds with the architectural detailing of the building.
5. The dimensions and position of the sign results in a noticeable change which erodes from the attractive qualities of the building in contrast to the more subtle and individually applied lettering advertisement it has replaced. It results in a cumbersome and unsympathetic impact to the buildings frontage.
6. The height of the illuminated fascia sign subject to appeal also exceed those of neighbouring fascia signs in the row which retain consistency in depth above

windows and door entrances. This in turn exacerbates the disparity of the appeal sign's dimensions.

7. Because of the sign's size and position it does not successfully tie in with the proportions of the building or other nearby frontage signage which contribute to the character of the area. This is largely because other existing signs don't have an excessive board height and are largely sympathetic to fenestration detailing. The consistency of such frontage detailing is a key part of the attractiveness of the street scene.
8. The resultant change does not improve the character and appearance of the area but instead erodes from the attractive qualities of the host building it is displayed on and the wider street scene when viewed from wider public vantage points along the limits of the highway. The effect is damaging to local character.
9. Therefore, I find that the sign is harmful to the character and appearance of the host building as well as the local area. It conflicts with Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011-2028 Core Strategy which encourages design that improves the appearance of the area; saved Policy EV/1 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan which encourages high standards of design and the provision of attractive frontages. Furthermore it conflicts with the aims of the Council's Leading in Design: Shopfronts and Signs Supplementary Planning Document (2006) which supports that proposals should represent an improvement of the building or street scene; as well as the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages good design principles, where the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the appellant's suggestions that the sign is of the dimensions and design proposed owing to lorries and other large vehicles parking in the road obscuring the shop, alongside existing parking issues; it allows customers to know where the shop is; that it is only lit during shop opening hours and that effort has been taken to ensure it is no higher than the stone parapet on adjoining buildings.
11. However, none of these points take away from the harm to the visual appearance of the host building and street scene I have identified which is what the outcome of the advertisement appeal specifically rests on rather than other considerations. This is because advertisements are subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. I appreciate that large vehicles may limit views of the shop but there is no significant public safety issue arising from the sign proposal itself and the existing parking problems described are not a matter before me. Accordingly, my decision is not altered by references to those other points.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal fails.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR