



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 July 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/Z/21/3273234

123B Granby Street, Leicester, LE1 6FD

- 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 Salam Dawood (The Granby Barbers) against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20201046, dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 February 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of internally illuminated fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The sign is already being displayed and I shall determine the appeal on that basis.
3. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Granby Street Conservation Area, in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the sign on the amenity of the surrounding area and the Granby Street Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within an area of central Leicester that at ground floor level is predominantly commercial in nature, with retail and associated uses fronting on to Granby Street. It is located within the CA, the significance of which is formed by the presence of a number of buildings of historic and visual note. Due to its positioning opposite Northampton Street, the appeal property is prominently located in views from a number of public vantage points.
6. There are many examples of fascia signage similar in size and positioning to that which is subject to the appeal on other premises on Granby Street. However, based on the evidence before me and my own observations during my site visit, they appear to be for the most part either non-illuminated or illuminated by an external source such as a trough light. Accordingly, their visual impact when illuminated will be more subtle and sympathetic than that resulting from the appeal proposal.

7. Although the appeal sign is not overly bulky in its size or profile, due to its internal illumination and prominent positioning, the sign will be a dominant, uncharacteristic and unsympathetic feature within the surrounding area and the CA when illuminated. This impact will cause harm to the amenity of the area and as a result fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
8. My attention has been drawn to a recently approved sign at 92 Granby Street which is on display, but this sign is not internally illuminated and instead has a trough light above it, which offers a more appropriate method of illumination. I have also been provided with details of previous signs that have been permitted by the Council on the appeal site. However, these now removed signs do not justify a sign that causes the harm that I have found, and, in any event, I am not bound by previous decisions of the Council.
9. There are likely to be benefits arising to the business from the display of an illuminated sign and I acknowledge the appellant's references to sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which they consider to be of relevance, but I can only base my judgement on the effect that the sign has on the interests of amenity. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the sign that is being displayed is the only form of sign from which the stated benefits could be achieved.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal has caused harm to the amenity of the surrounding area and the CA due to its internal illumination. I have taken into account Policies CS03 and CS18 of the Leicester Core Strategy 2014 which seek to protect amenity and the historic environment and so are material in this case, together with paragraph 132 of The Framework. Given I have concluded that the sign has caused harm to the amenity of the surrounding area and the CA, there is a conflict with these policies.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the display of the advertisement is detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR