



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/Z/24/3342867

139 Lee Road, London SE3 9DJ

- 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 David Freund against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 23/3377/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of one large hand painted sign on the side elevation of the application building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has cited Policies DH1, DH3, DH(f) and (j) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014) (RGLP), Policies HD1 and RLE2 of the Lee Neighbourhood Plan (2021-2031) (LNP) and Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan (2021) (LP) in its decision notice. However, the control of advertisements is exercisable only with respect to public safety and amenity and consequently, whilst they are material considerations, they are not decisive in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect on amenity with particular reference to the host building a locally listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies at the end of a terrace of three storey buildings of mid 19th century age; the whole terrace including Nos. 139-149 comprise a group of locally listed buildings. The terrace is constructed of yellow stock bricks with traditional features including stucco detailing, some original sash windows and deep eaves overhang to roof edge, with unusual curved corners and quoin detailing with rare surviving curved sash windows. The terrace has strong townscape value and is located within a commercial area with various shops and other uses located at ground floor levels, both within the terrace itself and opposite and to the south.
5. The existing signage at the appeal site and within the terrace currently consist predominantly of fascia signs as part of the shopfronts. Whilst these are almost all of modern design and appearance, they are concentrated at ground floor level with

the upper levels of the building devoid of any signage, allowing the full façade of the terrace to be appreciated.

6. The proposed sign would be hand painted and of traditional appearance and sited on the side, north facing elevation of the corner building on the appeal site. This flank elevation is, however, highly visible in the street scene in approaches from the north due to the immediately adjoining buildings being of only single storey height, to the immediate north of which is a bridge over a small river. In these views, the sign would be seen as a prominent feature on the flank elevation, taking up a large proportion of the existing attractive brickwork and whilst set in from the decorative corner quoin detailing, would extend below the sill levels of the adjoining windows. Furthermore, in these views from the north, it would be read as part of the wider terrace where it would appear as an incongruous feature within the terrace given the lack of signage at upper levels and would thereby disrupt and detract from the pleasant townscape value of the locally listed terrace.
7. Within the wider street scene, existing signage is also concentrated at ground floor levels, with very few at the first or second floor levels. An exception to this is the sign that has been applied to the second floor flank elevation of the building at No. 159 Lee Road. This building has a distinctive front elevation of red brick with stone surrounds to sash windows and ornate central section of arched windows with balcony feature. However, the side elevation on which the sign has been positioned, appears as a featureless blank wall with a mixture of red and buff brickwork, contrasting rather starkly with the ornate and detailed front elevation. In any event, the Council confirms that this sign does not have consent.
8. The appellant has provided details of a number of other painted signs both within the locality of the appeal site and further afield. However, none of these provide a direct comparison with the appeal site in respect of the character and appearance of the host building and position and type of sign proposed.
9. I find that the proposed sign would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the amenity of the area. In addition, it would fail to conserve the significance of the locally listed terrace to which it would be attached. This would conflict with RGLP Policies DH1, DH3, DH(f) and (j), LNP Policies HD1 and RLE2 and Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021 (LP) which seek high quality of design that takes account of the character and detailing of the host building, the wider local character and historic significance, protects the significance of heritage assets and to ensure that advertisements do not adversely affect the amenity of areas nor be unduly dominant where fixed to flank walls.
10. The proposed sign would also fail to satisfy the Framework which seeks to ensure that advertisements are not poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR