



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2025

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/24/3349744

203 - 209 Muswell Hill Broadway, Hornsey, Haringey, London N10 3RQ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Nationwide Building Society against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/0708.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement of internally illuminated fascia, projecting and ATM signs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. Whilst the Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers relevant to this appeal, and I have taken them into account as a material consideration, such policies have not, by themselves, been decisive in my determination of this appeal.
3. On my visit, I observed that fascia, projecting and automatic teller machine signs were being displayed at the appeal site, of a design that appeared in accordance with the submitted details. However, the position of the fascia and projecting sign relative to the corbel brackets and capitals of the shop surround did not appear to accord with the submitted plans. In these circumstances, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted drawings as a proposed scheme.

Main Issue

4. The Council has not identified harm to public safety and therefore the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the area, with particular regard to the character and appearance of the host building and the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is part of a terrace located within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area (CA). As such, in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990,

I have had regard to the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving and enhancing its character or appearance.

6. The CA is extensive and, according to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal (the Appraisal), is essentially an Edwardian suburb that developed around a once rural village settlement on one of the main routes into and out of London. The appeal site lies within the core area of Muswell Hill Broadway, the commercial centre at the heart of Muswell Hill. The significance of this part of the CA is, in part, derived from its aesthetic value arising from the consistency and detail of the design of the buildings within it.
7. The terrace containing the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the CA and the appeal building retains many of the original features of the terrace, including, at ground floor, the corbel brackets, capitals and cornice of the shop surround. The appeal property and the terrace it is within, therefore, contributes to the special character of the area.
8. The bottom of the proposed fascia sign would be sited below the capitals and, therefore, would not be fully within the original fascia 'zone'. In such a position it would partially overhang and obscure the 'shop' windows and the top and bottom would be lower than those of the two adjoining properties, neither of which extend below the capitals. Furthermore, the proposed projecting sign would be lower, and would not line up, with those displayed on the adjoining units.
9. The properties on Muswell Hill Broadway display fascia signs in a variety of positions, with others sited below the capitals of the respective unit. Nonetheless, in such a position the proposed fascia sign would disrupt the horizontal rhythm of the facias in this part of the terrace, which would be exacerbated by the inconsistent position of the projecting sign. Accordingly, such signs would appear incongruous in relation to the host building and the nearest properties within the terrace. This would amount to less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. The proposed materials, style, lettering and colours are relatively restrained and appropriate in relation to the appeal property and the wider area. The proposed fascia and projecting signs are internally illuminated, as are several others within the terrace, and there is nothing to suggest that the level of luminance is excessive. Furthermore, the evidence before me indicates that consent was given in 2022 to display internally illuminated fascia and projecting advertisements at the appeal premises, which had acrylic letters and logo which replaced internally illuminated acrylic signs. Overall, the fascia and projecting signs are not unusual in their dimensions and appearance in comparison with many others in the wider CA, and with those signs that the Council previously considered to be acceptable. Nevertheless, it remains that the proposed fascia and projecting signs are harmful to the CA, a designated heritage asset, by virtue of their inappropriate position on the building.
11. I acknowledge that there are benefits from the business through the provision of access to cash. Such benefits are not, however, reliant upon the proposed fascia and projecting sign and would be gained by advertisements that are more appropriately placed on the building.
12. I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and to the CA. Insofar as they are relevant to

the issue of amenity, it would be contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan, Policies DM3, DM8 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD, and Policies D8 and HC1 of the London Plan which, amongst other things, seek high quality development, which respects the local context and the significance of designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR