



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/Z/25/3358328

70 Commercial Street, Halifax, Calderdale, HX1 2JE

- 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 Mrs Sophie Davenport (Oh So Glow) against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/10012/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is three fascia signs, one illuminated and two non-illuminated.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application form gives full details and other information of three proposed signs. The decision notice describes the application in terms of only two signs. It is clear from the documentation that the proposal relates to three signs, and I have referred to three signs in my description above for the sake of clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed signs on the visual amenities of the Halifax Town Centre Conservation Area and the setting of the listed Halifax Building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the Halifax Town Centre Conservation Area (CA). The appeal property comprises part two-storey and part single-storey premises situated on the eastern side of Commercial Street, opposite to the Grade II listed Halifax Building. The two-storey element is half of a pair of semi-detached, stone-built premises, and the single-storey element is attached on its northern side. There is a gated access between the front door of the two-storey element and the single-storey element. Commercial Street at this point is a busy main road just outside of the main shopping centre of Halifax, where the primary activities are offices, a large pool and snooker club, and the small-scale commercial businesses at the appeal site and the neighbouring No 72.
5. The proposal would involve the siting of an illuminated “Oh So Glow” fascia sign above the front door; an “Oh So Services” non-illuminated sign between the front door and the ground-floor front window; and an “Oh So Tanned” non-illuminated sign on the northern side of the ground-floor windows in the single-storey building.

6. Policy BT1 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) requires that the design style proposed in new developments should respect or enhance the character and appearance of existing buildings and surroundings, taking account of its local context and distinctiveness, in particular any heritage assets. Policy HE1 of the LP requires that development proposals should conserve, and where appropriate, enhance, the historic environment, especially those elements which make a particularly important contribution to the identity, sense of place and local distinctiveness of Calderdale.
7. At the time of my visit, there were flat signs fixed to the walls in the positions of the proposed tray signs. In addition, there were further signs on the front elevation of the single-storey building – two small tray signs either side of the door; window signs with illumination behind in both of the windows; and an illuminated "open" sign in a glazed panel above the door. The proposed signs would be seen in conjunction with the small-scale stone buildings to which they would be attached, and also with the Grade II listed Halifax Building opposite, which is an iconic building in the town and listed for its architectural, design and planning interest,
8. The Halifax Building is currently undergoing extensive renovation works, but from the official list entry and from existing views of the building, it would appear that it has a largely open ground floor with two large floors of accommodation above. There would not appear to be any evidence that the building would have any illuminated signage, and the Council indicates that it has not given any permission for illuminated signs in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
9. The appellant has made note of signage on properties to the north of the appeal property on Wards End and around the junction of Commercial Street with Fountain Street. However, these are generally on shopping premises and/or on properties that mark the transition from the fringe location of the appeal site into the main shopping and commercial centre of the town to the north. In any case, the proposed signs on the appeal property would be on a scale that would dominate the small stone buildings on which they would be sited, and would also be seen directly in the context of the listed building opposite. The largely open and uncluttered nature of the ground floor of the Halifax Building would be compromised by the signage on the appeal property, and especially by the illuminated sign.
10. On the basis of the above, I consider that the signage would be harmful to the visual amenities of the immediate surroundings within the CA and also to the setting of the listed building. It would conflict with Policy BT1 of the LP and also with Policy HE1 of the LP. Although harm to the CA would be less than substantial, nevertheless the signage in its current form would not provide a significant public benefit that would outweigh the harm to the historic environment. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR